National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. WITHOUT CONCEALMENT....WITHOUT COMPROMISE. EDMUND QUINCY, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XIII. NO. 20. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1852. WHOLE NO. 644

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, TWO DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.

Pro-Slavery.

SLAVEHOLDING NEITHER A WRONG NOR A SIN.

BALTIMORE CITY, August 20, 1852.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK HERALD.

YOUR valuable paper of last week makes the following remarks, concerning a prevailing error with Northern men of both parties:

We have to remark, in conclusion, that with both parties in the North, and among the soundest men of both parties—Whigs and Democrats—there has been too much temporizing and truckling to the unclean spirit of Abolition and Free Soil, in all our elections, general and local, but particularly in our local elections. We doubt whether there is a single politician in the North—Whig or Democrat—that will have the moral courage, or has that practical common sense information, to proclaim, openly and above board, the morality and the humanity of the Southern institution of Slavery. There is scarcely a public journal in the North, excepting the *New York Herald*, that has had the independence or sagacity to adopt this practical view of the subject. Our view of Southern Slavery is, that it is an institution consistent alike with the dictates of humanity and the principles of morality. And such is our view of the Fugitive Slave law. The Southern slave is insured against starvation or the almshouse. He and his family have a lien for their support upon their master's estate, while they live. Africa, Hayti, and Jamaica, prove that Cuffee cannot get along without a master. Left to himself, he rapidly deteriorates back again to the savage cannibal. In the same community with the white man, there is for the negro no other relation of happiness or safety to either race than that of dependence and submission. The institution of Slavery in the South, then, being the only system adapted to the harmony of both races in the same community, we maintain that it is consistent with humanity and morality, common sense, the Bible, St. Paul, and the constitution.

The justness of all these observations must be felt and acknowledged by all men in this latitude. There has been, and yet is, too much yielding on the part of Northern Democrats, as well as Whigs, to what is termed the Anti-Slavery prejudices of the non-slaveholding States. Nearly all say, "we dislike Slavery in the abstract—we think it wrong, and would remove it, if we could; but we are opposed to interfering with it because of the deplorable consequences that will follow." Not one man will stand up and vindicate Slavery as a moral right. Not one will boldly stand up and proclaim it an institution of divine sanction. This is no way to fight Abolitionism—a far greater moral wrong than Slavery. Like yourselves, I choose the Bible as my platform, and, on the faith of what is contained in the holy book, I proclaim Abolitionism to be one of the greatest sins of which any man, professing Christian or otherwise, can be guilty. I say that Slavery, such as now exists in the United States, existed by sanction of the Almighty, thousands of years ago, and that in no instance was that institution visited with His displeasure. As it has always been a practice with me to prove everything as I pass along, I must here call the attention of your readers to the following, from the fourteenth verse of the fourteenth chapter of the book of Genesis: "And when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his own house—three hundred and eighteen—and pursued them unto Dan."

The persons pursued unto Dan were the captors of Abram's brother, and the pursuers were his 'trained servants, born in his own house." Abram, was, therefore, a large slaveholder, for his servants were "trained and born in his own house." This is proof that they were his property, because hired servants are never born in the house of the man who employs them. But to remove all doubt about Abram being a slaveholder, let me here introduce the thirteenth and twenty-third verses of the seventeenth chapter of the book of Genesis:

"And God said unto Abraham, he that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant."

"And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham's house, and circumcised the flesh of their fore-skin on the self same day, as God had said unto him."

There can be no mistake about this. Here is the proof that Abraham had slaves of his own raising, and others bought with his money, just as is the case with slaveholders of the present day. Well, was Abraham censured by his Divine Master, for thus dealing in human souls as he did in cattle, as the Abolitionists express it? I find no such thing in the record. On the contrary, the proof is in every page of that book that Abraham enjoyed God's special confidence, and received numerous favours from his hands. I will now give your readers one or two of these proofs. Accordingly, I will quote first, the 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th verses of the 22d chapter of the book of Genesis:

"And the Angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of Heaven the second time:

"And said, by myself hath I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son;

"That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the Heaven, and as the sand upon the sea shore, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."

I should be pleased to hear what Messrs. Seward, Johnston, Greeley, Stevens, Weed, Wade, Sumner, Chase, Hale, and other Abolitionists, have to say to this. I have not only proven that Abraham was a very large slaveholder—having servants bought with his money, and servants of his own raising—but that God blessed him, and promised that, in his seed, all the nations of the earth should be blessed. It follows, then, that the institution of Slavery among the children of Israel was not offensive in the sight of God, because He gave no instruction to Abraham, or his descendants, to emancipate them. He did not see any moral wrong in it, or proclaim that it would, at any time, prove a curse to that people. Slavery, as we find it existing in the United States, appears to be precisely like that prevailing in the days of Abraham; and yet, our Abolitionists undertake to denounce what God appeared not only to have tolerated, but to have authorized. In substantiation of this last word, you may here permit me to quote the following passages from the twenty-fifth chapter of the book of Leviticus:

"I am the Lord, your God, which brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, to give you the land of Canaan, and to be your God."

"And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond servant.

"But as an hired servant and as a sojourner, he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee.

"And then shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return.

"For they are my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt—they shall not be sold as bondmen.

"Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you: of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids.

"Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession.

"And ye shall take them, as an inheritance, for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen for ever."

Now, here we have a distinction made between a hired servant and a bond servant, which is proof enough that the latter means a slave, as we now understand the term. Moreover, if we examine Webster's dictionary, we will find that bond-man means a man slave, and bond-woman a woman slave. No man or woman, however, of common sense, will deny that these terms mean slaves, otherwise authority to buy them would not have been given to the children of Israel.

The words above quoted from the 25th chapter of the Book of Leviticus are a part of the sayings of the Lord unto Moses in Mount Sinai; in other words, they constitute a part of God's instructions to him. From those instructions it appears that the Children of Israel were authorised to buy their own poor, and hold them in a sort of bondage for a term of years, in addition to buying bondmen and bondwomen of the heathen round about them, and the strangers sojourning among them. The conditions exacted of them were that they "should not rule with rigour over their brethren," but allow them fair wages until the price paid for them should have been redeemed. Of the heathen and the strangers they were authorized to "buy bondmen and bondmaids," as a possession for themselves and their children after them," and to hold them as their "bondmen for ever."

Now, unless the editors of the New York *Tribune* and *Evening Past* can prove that God afterwards revoked this authority, or that St. Paul did not direct servants to obey their masters—and, having "masters," they were slaves of course—I am justified in saying that the institution of Slavery, as we find it existing in our Southern States, has received the Divine sanction. The passages which I have quoted above make this clear to every man's mind; and there is nothing on record to show that the Son of God, our Saviour, uttered one word in condemnation of the institution during His pilgrimage on the earth. According to the authority conferred upon the Children of Israel by their Divine Lord and Master, there is no sin committed in buying slaves of the African race, and holding them as our possession. They are as essentially heathens as any people that lived round about the Children of Israel, and stand in quite as much need, no doubt, of the civilizing influences that are connected with their enslavement. If Slavery was no abomination in the sight of God, and if it brought no curse, according to the record, upon the Children of Israel, I see not how Messrs. Seward, Greeley, Hale, and Chase, can discover any wrong about it, or for what reason they need apprehend any evil to our nation from it. They can find no "higher law" than the authority of the Great Jehovah, and His law is in favour of Slavery.

Such being the case, I marvel that any man in the non-slaveholding States (Whig or Democrat) should yield an inch to the Abolitionists and Free Soilers, who denounce Slavery and seek its extinction. With such a platform to stand upon as the Bible affords them, they can denounce Abolitionism as a sin, and one of the very worst sins too of which any mortal can be guilty. To denounce or oppose Slavery, conducted upon benign and humane principles, is to bring them into direct collision with God's instructions to Moses; and to "execrate and spit upon" that part of the Whig or Democratic platform which secures the restoration of fugitive slaves to their owners, is to scoff at and make a mockery of God's law. With such a platform to stand upon as the 25th chapter of the Book of Leviticus, every good man can prove Abolitionism to be a sin against Heaven of the highest grade, and justly hold up every Abolitionist and Free Soiler to the execration of the people. Why, then, should any candidate for public favour in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Ohio, or elsewhere, truckle to the unchristian spirit of Abolitionism and Free Soilism, and gratify that God-condemned faction so much as to say, that the Fugitive Slave Law is "opposed to humanity and moral right." Instead of doing this, let them bid the hypocritical Abolitionists that defiance which they deserve. Let them take the constitution first, and prove that Abolitionism is virtual treason to their country; and let them take the Bible next, and prove that Abolitionism is in violation of God's authority, and should emanate only from open-mouthed infidels. If the Bible is not a fiction or a fable, I contend that no man can reverence God and be an Abolitionist at the same time—no man can claim to be a Christian whilst he hesitates to denounce it. When we make war upon Slavery, we set ourselves above our Great Creator, and profess to know more than He does, and to be far righteous than He. He has sanctioned and authorized Slavery, and the proof I have already given. That proof I defy all the Greeleys, Sewards, Hales and Chases in the universe to weaken in the slightest degree.

A SOUTHERN MAN,
But not a Slaveholder.

"WHEN the series of measures known under the collective term of the Compromise were passed by Congress, in 1850, and put to so searching a test, here at the North, the reverence of the people for the constitution, and their attachment to the Union, General Pierce was true to the principles which he had long ago avowed. At an early period of his Congressional service, he had made known, with the perfect frankness of his character, those opinions upon the Slavery question, which he has never since seen occasion to change in the slightest degree. There is an unbroken consistency in his action with regard to this matter. It is entirely of a piece from his first entrance upon public life until the moment when he came forward, while many were faltering, to throw the great weight of his character and influence into the scale in favour of those measures through which it was intended to redeem the pledges of the constitution, and to preserve and renew the old love and harmony among the sisterhood of the States. His approval embraced the whole series of these acts as well as those which bore hard upon Northern views and sentiments, as those which the South deemed itself to have made more than reciprocal concessions."

"No friend nor enemy, that knew Franklin Pierce, would have expected him to act otherwise. With his view of the whole subject, whether looking at it through the medium of his conscience, his feelings, or his intellect, it was impossible for him not to take his stand as the unshaken advocate of Union, and of the mutual steps of compromise which that great object unquestionably demanded. The fiercest, the least scrupulous, and the most consistent of those who battle against Slavery recognise the same fact that he does. They see that merely human wisdom and human efforts cannot subvert it, except by tearing to pieces the constitution, breaking the pledges which it sanctions, and severing into distracted fragments that common country which Providence brought into one nation, through a continued miracle of almost two hundred years, from the first settlement of the American wilderness until the revolution. In the days when, a young member of Congress, he first raised his voice against agitation, Pierce saw these perils and their consequences. He considered, too, that the evil would be certain, while the good was, at best, a contingency, and (to the clear, practical foresight with which he looked into the future) scarcely so much as that, attended, as the movement was, and must be, during its progress, with the aggravated injury of those whose condition it aimed to ameliorate, and terminating, in its possible triumph—if such possibility there were—with the ruin of two races which now dwelt together in greater peace and affection, it is not too much to say, than had ever elsewhere existed between the taskmaster and the serf.

"Of course, there is another view of all these matters. The theorist may take that view in his closet; the philanthropist by profession may strive to act upon it uncompromisingly, amid the tumult and warfare of his life. But the statesman of practical sagacity—who loves his country as it is, and evolves good from things as they exist, and who demands to feel his firm grasp upon a better reality before he quits the one already gained—will be likely here, with all the greatest statesmen of America, to stand in the attitude of a conservative. Such, at all events, would be the attitude of Franklin Pierce.

"We have sketched some of the influences amid which he grew up, inheriting his father's love of country, mindful of the old patriot's valour in so many conflicts of the revolution, and having close before his eyes the example of brothers and relatives, more than one of whom have bled for America, both at the extremest North and farthest South; himself, too, in early manhood, serving the Union in its legislative halls, and, at a maturer age, leading his fellow-citizens, his brethren, from the widest-sundered States, to redden the same battle-fields with their kindred blood, to unite their breath into one shout of victory, and perhaps to sleep, side by side, with the same sod over them. Such a man, with such hereditary recollections, and such a personal experience, must narrow himself to adopt the cause of one section of his native country against another. He will stand up, as has always stood, among the patriots of the whole land. And if the work of Anti-Slavery agitation, which, it is undeniable, leaves most men who earnestly engage in it with only half a country in their affections—if this work must be done, let others do it.

"Those Northern men, therefore, who deem the great cause of human welfare all represented and involved in this present hostility against Southern institutions, and who conceive that the world stands still, except so far as that goes forward—these, it may be allowed, can scarcely give their sympathy or their confidence to the subject of this memoir. But there is still another view; and probably as wise a one. It looks upon Slavery as one of those evils which divine Providence does not leave to be remedied by human contrivances, but which, in its own good time, by some means impossible to be anticipated, but of the simplest and easiest operation, when all its uses shall have been fulfilled, it causes to vanish like a dream.

"There is no instance, in all history, of the human will and intellect having perfected any great moral reform by methods which it adopted to that end; but the progress of the world, at every step, leaves some evil or wrong on the path behind it which the wisest of mankind, of their own sole purpose, could never have found the way to rectify. Whatever contributes to the great cause of good, contributes to all its sub-divisions and varieties; and, on this score, the lover of his race, the enthusiast, the philanthropist of whatever theory, might lend his aid to put a man, like the one before us, into the leadership of the world's affairs."—*Hawthorne's Life of Gen. Franklin Pierce.*

Selections.

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

A PUBLIC meeting, under the auspices of the Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society, was held on Wednesday night, at 7 o'clock, in the Rev. Dr. French's Church, College Street, for the purpose of hearing an address from the Rev. Professor Willis, of the Free Church College, Toronto, on 'the present position of the Anti Slavery cause, the hardships caused by the Fugitive Slave Act, and the claims of the Canada Refugee Relief Society.' In the course of an able speech, Professor Willis said:

Much had been said of infidel agitators and Abolitionists. He wished to take the opportunity of making some necessary distinctions here. It was not sufficiently understood, that there was in the American Union a large and increasing band of intelligent and pious men, who kept apart from the more libertine agitators. He had himself been present at the Anniversary Meeting of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, of which the Messrs. Tappans, of New York, were influential members. He would never forget the truly religious bearing of the leaders of that society, nor the impression made upon him by their grave and dignified appeals to Holy Scripture. It was a libel on America—a grevious misrepresentation—to affirm that the agitation against slaveholding was identical, in the Union, with agitation against regular government, or against the Sabbath and the Christian religion. Some of the best and the holiest men in that republic were in the front of this truly Christian enterprise; and as to the more notorious—and he would also say more absurd—class of emancipationists, they were not as a body either libertine or infidel. A few individuals had indeed given some appearance of truth to this charge by their loose sayings. With these he had no sympathy. But because some men of violent passions, or erroneous principles, happened to be among the enemies of a real oppression, was this to make them more indifferent to the momentous interest at stake—an interest independent of parties, he might say in some sense of creeds—for it was the common interest of humanity, which even an infidel might justly press—though the Christian was bound tenfold to maintain forth its advocate. And he must say that an uncandid use had been made of this fact—of some men of lax opinions, in other questions, being found among the asserters of liberty for the slave.

He did not know the peculiar opinions of Mr. Garrison; but he could say of him, that through all America, he was admitted to be a man of pure and disinterested aim, in the service of this and many a philanthropic cause. He was admitted by those who differed widely from him, on other questions, to be a most humane, honourable and self-denying philanthropist and citizen (cheers). He held in his hand, at this moment, one of his latest communications to an Anti-Slavery Society—in a meeting at which he was unable to be present. It was full of scriptural views—in fact, of scriptural quotations. Dr. Willis read the letter, and then asked if that was infidelity? Was not that Christian pleading? Was there aught there to alarm the most Orthodox (cheers)? But observe, continued Dr. Willis, they who wished to be more particular in the choice of associates in this cause, had no longer excuse for inaction. The British and Foreign American Society was disjoined from him and his immediate associates. The position of either society was, however, as concerned the slave, far more Orthodox and more Christian than the mass of the churches and the clergy in the Union. It was a lamentable fact, that, with some honourable exceptions, the professing ministers of the gospel stood back, and looked on with passive unconcern on a system of unrighteousness. Dr. Willis read a statement from the latest report of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, to the effect that, although the body called Covenanters and Associate Reformed, also, of the Methodists, Friends, Baptists, and Episcopalians were Anti-Slavery in principle, too many of their religionists, while professing to abhor Slavery, were indifferent or opposed to Anti-Slavery efforts. The American Tract Society and the American Sunday School Union refused to publish any work on the sinfulness of American Slavery, and carefully expurgated all sentiments offensive to the South, in its reprints of foreign publications. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions allowed their missionaries among the Indians to organize and superintend churches composed, in part, of slaveholders and slaves. The Presbyterian General Assembly (old school) and the Cumberland Presbyterian Assembly, refused to legislate on the subject of Slavery, on the plea that, as spiritual bodies, they had no cognizance of civil matters. Dr. Willis here expressed his conviction, that when Dr. Duff gave the advantage of his justly respected name to the certificate of the Orthodoxy of this body, from the Moderators of the Free Church Assembly, he must have been surely unaware of the position they took on this great question of religion and morals. In addressing Dr. Baird, of New York, as a representative of the missionary enterprise of that Church, it was, perhaps, natural enough to pay some tribute to the body he represented; but whatever praise was due to them for orthodoxy in some matters, he must say they were far from orthodox in this (cheers). He apprehended that the encomium pronounced in such unqualified terms would be understood to express approbation of their general course as witnesses for God's truth. Would any present regard as faithful exponents of the New Testament, or witnesses for truth, men who, looking on while millions were debarred, by the slave law, even from seeing the Word of the living God, or from being allowed to search the Scriptures, a the Saviour of the world had commanded them, would decline to bear any public or united testimony against the atrocity (sensation)? What a pretext to allege that, as spiritual bodies, they had no cognizance of civil matters! What, not even to remonstrate with legislatures? What Voluntary would defend such an absurd plan (hear, hear)? He would do his Voluntary friends, in this country, the justice to say—though he himself had always held the principle of an Establishment—that they would disown such a misrepresentation of their views, as that these required such a course of inaction on the part of religious bodies, where so great interests of humanity, and religion, too—nay, liberty of conscience and natural liberty—were at take (cheers). The Presbyterian General Assembly (new school), while they had borne testimony against the evils of Slavery, and asserted that these should be corrected by discipline, admitted slaveholders to a seat in their council, and treated them in all respects as if free from scandal.—*Edinburgh Scottish Press.*

LOSS ON SLAVE LABOUR.

It has been observed by most of those who have travelled through the United States, that the difference of the general aspect of the slave States, compared with the free, is greatly in favour of the latter. The exhausted fields and dilapidated buildings everywhere to be seen in the old settled parts of the slave States, contrasted with the productive farms and flourishing villages visible in the free, furnish evidence too clear to be mistaken, of the impolicy of Slavery. Adam Smith many years ago assigned as the reason why Slavery had never prevailed to any great extent in the Northern colonies of North America, that they produced no staple commodity which could bear the expense of slave cultivation. And experience, since his day, has confirmed the opinion, that the system requires for its support advantages of climate or soil which are not generally to be met with. It appears to be a general rule that the slave extracts more from the soil than he returns to it. For this, several reasons may be assigned; but my object is not to investigate the subject at large, but to endeavour to examine one of its branches.

Whether man are in a state of freedom or slavery, the mass of the community must depend for their support on the product of their labour; and it is probably admitted on all hands that the labour of slaves is much less effective than that of freemen.

Bryan Edwards, in his history of the West Indies, in the description of his first gang, when they have had their dinner and two hours of rest, remarks that they then "manifest some signs of vigorous and animated application; although I can with great truth assert that one English labourer, in his own climate, would perform three times the work of any one negro in the same period."* Dr. Prichard, in his Notes on the West Indies, estimates the work performed with ease by two Europeans, as equivalent to what twelve slaves are accustomed to effect.† Joshua Steele, a planter in Barbadoes, tried the effect of substituting the hope of reward for the fear of punishment. By offering his slave a small premium, to be paid on condition that a certain task should be performed, he obtained from them three times as much work, in a given time, as without it.‡ Dr. Cooper, in his letters on political economy, published in 1826 at Columbia, South Carolina, estimates the labour of a slave at two-thirds of what a white labourer, at usual wages, would perform. This comparison was probably made between slave and free labour in a slave State, where the activity of the white man is influenced by the customary movements of slaves.

With these authorities in view, we may safely assume the labour of one freeman as equivalent to that of two slaves. Hence we may perceive that the loss to the United States, in their collective capacity, from the system of Slavery, must be enormous.

According to the census of 1850, there were then in the United States 3,175,589 slaves. This number, compared with the census of 1840, would furnish about 486,000 men between 24 and 55 years of age; or between 21 and 50. If, then, we take no account of the females of any age, or the males of a lower or of a later period of life, and confine our attention to the 486,000 men, whom we suppose to be between 21 and 50 years of age, we shall find the loss on their labour to amount to a sum of which it is difficult to form a conception.

Upon the estimate above mentioned, these 486,000 slaves perform the work of only 243,000 freemen. Hence, by holding them in Slavery, the services of 243,000 men are lost to the community. But the whole number, whether they work or not, must be maintained. The loss may therefore be set down at the whole sum which 243,000 free men would earn. This cannot be estimated below $100 a year for each, or $24,300,000 in all. This would defray the expense of constructing about a thousand miles of railroad. Of course the loss in a few years would be equivalent to the expense of constructing a railroad from New York to the mouth of the Columbia river.

Large as this sum must appear, it can hardly be [illegible] all free, and inured to the habits of freemen, their labour would annually add to the wealth of the nation more than the sum above given; for the calculation has been made on the men under fifty, leaving the males beyond that age, and all of the females, out of the reckoning.

Now the annual average increase of the slave population from 1790 to 1850 was 2·56 per cent. Of course our computed yearly loss should be increased in that ratio, in case the existing system should be permitted to go on. Let us then suppose this system to continue fifty years, or till the beginning of next century; and estimating money, or its equivalent in other property, to be worth five per cent. per annum, endeavour to ascertain how much poorer the people of the United States will be, on the opening of the ensuing century, with Slavery than they would be without it.

A yearly sum of $24,300,000, with interest at five per cent., would amount in fifty years to $5,087,600,000. But it we take into calculation the annual increase of 2·56 per cent., we shall have an amount no less than $7,859,790,000—a sum of which we can form no adequate conception. This latter sum in gold dollars of 25·8 grains, would make 12,997 tons avoirdupois; or a load for 13 ships of nearly one thousand tons burden.

E. L.

—*Friends' Review.*

* Vol. ii. p. 123. † Vol. i. p. 257.
‡ Dickinson's Mitigation of Slavery.

SLAVERY IN CUBA.

In spite of treaties and prohibitions, the slave trade still flourishes in Cuba, and forms a rich source of income for the Spanish officials who share indirectly in its profits. We learn by a private letter from a trustworthy person, that some six weeks since 500 negroes were disembarked at Ortigosa, and that Canedo, the Captain-General, pocketed $34 per head for conniving at the act. No wonder the Cubans desire to be freed from a Government which adds to perfect despotism such corruption as this.

The character of Slavery in Cuba is in some respects worse than in our own Southern States. Of its main features an intelligent German, who recently visited the island, gives an interesting account. He says that slaves there are taken care of about as well as work horses in Europe. Marriage is unknown among them. They are without all religious or mental instruction. Every year a priest baptizes the whole lot of children born on the plantation, and Sunday afternoons they are made to say an Ave Maria, the creed and a pater noster. They always work with an overseer standing over them with a heavy whip. The lowest overseers are themselves slaves, and have the right to inflict three blows. The white overseers have the right to inflict twenty-five blows, a punishment which results in several days' illness. You find no slave who has not been punished, and even men of four score are met with who still have to submit to the scourge. The women are flogged by their husbands, in the presence of the head overseer.

At 10 in the morning the oxen of the plantation are driven under shelter from the heat. But the slaves continue to work without interruption through the day. They are also kept late at night. On some plantations they are highly favoured if they are allowed to sleep two whole nights in a week. The master is not allowed to inflict the punishment of death, but in case of great crimes must hand the slave over to the authorities, when he may renounce his property in the negro, which frees him from responsibility for costs of trial, food, &c. But this is almost never done. Useless and incorrigible negroes are got rid of "in a more simple way without troubling the authorities." Prostitution is universal on the plantations, beginning at the age of 10. But the woman who has a mulatto child is liable to fifty blows of the whip.

At 9 in the evening all the slaves who are not destined to night work, are shut up by families in stalls, where they sleep on boards. Each family has a pig to fat, and a little piece of land which is cultivated on Sunday afternoons. Every slave receives yearly two suits of linen, a blanket and a woolen cap. Bread they do not receive, but have three rations daily of bananas, mangoes, sweet potatoes, corn, dried fish, and dried beef, which is imported from Buenos Ayres.

The freedom of an unborn child can be bought for twenty-five dollars, and fathers often adopt this way of emancipating their children. Many slaves escape into the mountains; such are exposed to the pursuit of bloodhounds and are also betrayed by vultures hovering over their places of refuge. Many hang themselves with the idea that after death they will find themselves, with the same bodies as before, at home in Africa. By way of stopping this practice, the owners have the remains of the suicides cut to pieces; rather than return to their native country thus mutilated, they prefer to live and suffer in Cuba.

Such is the condition of a great proportion of the inhabitants of that lovely island. What effect the independence of the island would have upon the peculiar institution is a question. There is no doubt, however, that it would stop the introduction of negroes from abroad.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

DEBATE IN THE SENATE ON THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

THE Speech of Mr. Sumner, in the U. S. Senate, on the Fugitive Slave Law, which we have already published from the pamphlet edition, was followed, as our readers probably know, by a debate at length. This debate, in its serial reports, the *Union* reached only a few days ago, and we caused to lay it before our readers, though it comes only in season for us to commence its publication this week. The conclusion will follow in the next number.

Mr. BADGER obtained the floor, but gave way to

Mr. CLEMENS, who rose and said: Mr. President, I was going to express a wish that none of our friends would see proper to reply to the speech with which the Senate has just been inflicted. I shall not do so, however, because some of them may differ with me in opinion. The ravings of a maniac may sometimes be dangerous, but the barking of a puppy never did any harm.

Mr. BADGER. I think I may say, without hazard or fear of contradiction, that the Senate of the United States never heard a more extraordinary speech than that which has just been delivered by the senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Sumner]—extraordinary in its character, and most extraordinary in the time and the occasion which the gentleman chose for its delivery. We have heard a speech delivered by the senator from Massachusetts—not a speech in the ordinary sense in which we use that term, when describing what is said by honourable gentlemen in the progress of debate, but an elaborate oration, carefully written, studied, committed to memory, and interspersed in various parts with curious quotations from modern learning and ancient lore, and every now and then dignified and adorned with Latin quotations, which, when the senator did not condescend to translate them into English, I presume were very unintelligible to most of the members of this body. Three hours and three-quarters has the gentleman occupied at this late period of the session with this discussion. He came here pledged, if it is possible that language delivered elsewhere can pledge a man, to immediate, prompt and persevering efforts for the repeal of the fugitive slave law.

Mr. SUMNER. Never.

Mr. BADGER. He came here, as I will show, pledged, if the language of the senator has any meaning, to immediate, instantaneous efforts for the repeal of the fugitive slave law. Seven months of the session had passed away; we had got far into the month of July before any effort, that I ever heard of, was made by the senator to introduce this subject to the consideration of the Senate. He then presented a resolution, and asked that it might be taken up for consideration; but, after a remark made by the senator from Virginia [Mr. Mason], it I recollect rightly—for I was not here, but saw these things mentioned in the public prints—that it would be too late to make a reply to the gentleman at that period of the session, the Senate refused to assent to diplomatic appropriation bill before us, the general man offers a proviso to an appropriation in that bill for meeting the extraordinary expenditures in the judiciary department, for the repeal of the fugitive slave law; and upon that motion, in the language of the senator from Alabama [Mr. Clemens], he "inflicts" on the Senate an oration of three hours and three-quarters.

The gentleman's oration divides itself into argument and into rhetorical display. I want to say a few words with regard to his argument; and let us see on what grounds he bases the confident assertion that the fugitive slave law which he wishes to repeal is a violation of the constitution of the country.

He sets out with the declaration that it is a fundamental error in treating this subject to suppose that Slavery in the United States is a national institution, and therefore entitled to the assistance and the protection of the laws of Congress. Now, if anybody makes this mistake, I do not make it. I do not suppose, and never had supposed, that it was a national institution. It is a State institution where it exists. If it were a national institution, it would be liable to national control; and it would be liable, for aught I know, to abolition by the national authority. It is a State institution, and I do not claim, nor do I know anybody who does, that it is an institution which belongs to the United States of America as such. Then, what is the position that it occupies? It is this: It is like many other State institutions, which are purely sectional, and yet, under the constitution, are entitled to a certain degree of aid, under certain circumstances, from the general government. The government of each State is a State institution; but if an insurrection break out against that government, it is the duty of the United States, when called upon, to put it down. The constitution of a State is a matter of State arrangement; it is sectional; it belongs to the State; it is not national, and yet, under the constitution, the United States are bound to guaranty to every State a republican form of government. So also the crimes committed against a State are not offences against the nation; they are offences against the laws of the State in which they are committed, and the United States have no power or jurisdiction to try such offences. They do not exist under the laws of the United States as such; but they exist under the laws of the State, and are therefore sectional and particular, not national and general. But yet, under the constitution, if one of these offenders—a person who has committed a crime against one of the States of the Union—escapes into another State, he shall be surrendered to the authorities of the State from which he escaped, for the purpose of there having his trial. Every proof, therefore, offered by the senator from Massachusetts to show that Slavery is not national is an argument urged on a point which is not in issue. Slavery is sectional. It exists in the several States of the Union, where it does exist, as an institution of those respective States. It is not a national institution; but under the constitution, as in the one case of the fugitive from the justice of the State escapes into another, he shall be delivered up to be tried by the authority from which he escaped; so the slave, if he escapes into another State where Slavery is not recognised, shall not be discharged by any law of that State, but shall be returned to the person to whom he may owe the service.

So much for the preliminary observation. In the next place, the senator says that this act, which he proposes by his proviso to repeal, is a violation of the constitution, for the several reasons which he assigns. Now, let me remark that there is not a single part of the act to which the senator's proviso applies, which he has characterized as militating against the constitution of the United States, that does not apply with equal force to the act passed in 1793. That act, like the present one, contemplates a surrender promptly upon a summary investigation before a magistrate, and without a jury. That act, like the recent act, makes the decision of the magistrate, whom it constitutes the summary tribunal, conclusive upon the question of the delivery up of the party, and of the right to remove him to the State from which he escaped. Here, then, we have this proposition advanced by the gentleman to-day. We have an act passed in 1793—in less than four years after the government was put into operation under the constitution, while Washington was President, and while there were a considerable number of gentlemen in the two houses of Congress who had been themselves members of the convention which framed the constitution—I say here we have an act passed in the House of Representatives, upon the yeas and nays, with, if my memory serves me, but seven dissenting votes; and every gentleman there, especially those from the New England and Middle States (and there were several who had been members of the convention which framed the constitution), voted, on the yeas and nays, in favour of the bill.

There was one gentleman from Maryland, and one gentleman from Virginia, I think, who voted against it. And, what is very remarkable, the bill passed the Senate apparently without a division; certainly without a call of the yeas and nays. That act, then, thus passed—thus approved by Washington, and put in force, I believe, without any difficulty whatever in regard to its constitutionality, recognised as constitutional before every tribunal before which the question ever came, whether that tribunal was a national or a State tribunal, until the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Prigg *vs.* Pennsylvania, which produced hostile legislation in the northern country—is now pronounced by the senator from Massachusetts to be a violation of the constitution. Well, sir, *prima facie*, if we had no other means of judging, it would seem quite reasonable to suppose that the distinguished men of 1793, who had been members of the convention which made the constitution, and those who were contemporaneous with the making of it, and the discussions which followed upon the question of its adoption—understood the constitution quite as well as the senator from Massachusetts, and the Anti-Slavery Society of the State which he represents. They were then fresh from the making of that instrument. This was an act passed under no party excitement. It was reported, considered and decided upon, as a measure of legislation, to carry out the requirement of the constitution; and if those gentlemen understood the constitution according to the interpretation given to it by the senator from Massachusetts to-day, they violated their oaths when they voted for that bill; for there is no pretence on which such a bill can be passed by us, or could be passed by them, without a violation of our and their oaths, except it be that that clause of the constitution in relation to fugitive slaves is a clause to be executed by the United States. I remark, therefore, in the first place, that the presumption is entirely in favour of the interpretation which has prevailed for largely more than half a century, and is very much against the novel one which the purpose of certain persons in the United States renders it necessary they should now bring forward. Allow me to say that I do not agree with gentlemen, when these elaborate propositions are brought forward and delivered with confidence, and adorned with that kind of eloquence which the senator from Massachusetts brings here, and circulated through the country, specious and delusive as we know them to be, that it is by no means necessary they should be considered and exposed.

But, sir, the senator's first objection, as I have mentioned, is, that, under this provision of the Constitution, Congress has no power to pass a law of the kind; that it is in the nature of a compact to be executed between the States; and that the several States are to determine for themselves in what sense and to what extent it is binding, and how far and in what manner they will execute it. Let us inquire for a moment on what pretence that is founded. These provisions with regard to fugitives from justice and fugitives from labour form the two last clauses of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution, and are in these words:

"A person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall, on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime.

"No person held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due."

Now, Mr. President, it might admit of some question if there might be a possible doubt with regard to from justice, because that clause refers to State instrumentality. The fugitive from justice is to be delivered up upon demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled; but in the second clause there is no reference to any State authority or jurisdiction whatever, direct or remote. With regard to the first of these clauses this same act of 1793 has prescribed the whole proceeding for its being enforced and carried into execution. It has directed the kind of evidence on which the application is to be made; it has directed every step to be taken to make it the duty of the executive of the State to which the fugitive has escaped, under the Constitution, to cause him to be delivered at the call of the executive of that State from which he escaped. It being, I believe, clearly admitted on all hands, and denied by nobody—because there is no purpose of political agitation to be answered by such a denial—that the first of these clauses is to be executed under the authority of an act of Congress, I pray you ask yourselves how it is possible that the second clause is left as a mere agreement or compact, to be executed at the will and pleasure, and in the degree and manner in which the several States may think proper. On that subject, Mr. President, I beg to read what I consider very high authority. It is what is said by Mr. Justice Story in regard to this clause for the surrender of fugitives from service. In his Commentaries on the Constitution he thus expresses himself:

"This clause was introduced into the Constitution solely for the benefit of the slaveholding States, to enable them to reclaim their fugitive slaves who should have escaped into other States where Slavery was not tolerated. The want of such a provision, under the confederation, was felt as a grievous inconvenience by the slaveholding States, since in many States no aid whatever would be allowed to the owners; and sometimes, indeed, they met with open resistance. In fact, it cannot escape the attention of every intelligent reader, that many sacrifices of opinion and feeling are to be found made by the Eastern and Middle States to the peculiar interests of the South. This forms no just subject of complaint; but it should never repress the delusive and mischievous notion, that the South has not at all times had its full share of benefits from the Union."

Mr. Justice Story here informs us that that provision was introduced expressly for the benefit of the slaveholding States, the want of such a provision in the Articles of Confederation being a subject of grievous complaint. Why so? Because they not only received no assistance, but in some of the States they were actually met with open resistance. If that were the purpose of introducing the clause, how absurd to suppose that, when the clause was introduced, it was to do nothing but to leave them at the mercy of those very States which had refused to aid them to correct which grievance that clause was introduced into the Constitution!

Mr. SUMNER. Will the senator from North Carolina allow me to ask him whether there was any authority for this broad statement anterior to that of Mr. Justice Story?

Mr. BADGER. Mr. Justice Story cites the authorities. They will be found in a foot note.

Mr. SUMNER. I would like to know who they are?

Mr. BADGER. The senator from Massachusetts can examine the book for himself.

Mr. SUMNER. My own examination has brought me to the conclusion that there was no sufficient authority for the statement as made by him—most certainly none until after the National Convention.

Mr. BADGER. I think the senator said that before; and I w

tion as to make it entirely fruitless in practice into dispose of their property in their dying hours, otherwise, the slave is surrendered, and the difficulty is not that the free man shall be "kidnapped into their slave to be emancipated; not on the principle of Slavery, but that the man who is truly a slave shall be returned to his master." The senator from Massachusetts considers that when a slave escapes from his master, he is entitled to protection and security; so that this solicitude about the constitution, and the anxiety to refer the matter back to the States, resolves itself plainly into this—that the States may prevent the execution of that clause of the constitution which Justice Story affirms was inserted for the benefit of the slaveholder.

In the next place, the senator from Massachusetts has laid down with considerable confidence the proposition that that clause does not, either directly or by any fair interpretation, include the slave, because the word "slave" is not mentioned in it. Well, I suppose that all depends on the meaning of the word "slave." It depends on whether a slave is a a person who is held to service. If he is held to service or labour, he comes within the clause of the constitution; and it is immaterial whether the term is mentioned or not. According to the constitution, any person who, under the laws of a particular State, is held to service or labour, who escapes into another, shall be restored to the person who has the claim to that service.

Then, the next objection that the senator has taken is, that the fugitive slave law is a violation of the constitution, because it does not give trial by jury; and he has referred to a good many cases in England and elsewhere, and shown, what nobody has denied, that, according to the principles of the common law, when a claim is made by suit to settle the question whether a man is or is not a slave, it is a regular action at law to be tried by a jury. There is no question of that; there is no doubt about it; but what has that to do with the question. I should be glad to know from any legal gentleman in this body, what instance there is in which the common law ever empannels a jury to decide a fact, except where a decision of that fact by the jury will be final between the parties to the issue? There is no other case. And so careful is the common law on that subject, as all legal men know, that if an action is brought against a man, and he puts in a plea in abatement, bringing forward some matter in his plea to show why the writ should be abated, and having no reference whatever as to the merits of the cause of action, and the plaintiff take issue upon the truth of the plea, and it is tried by a jury, and the verdict be against the plea, the judgment may not only extend to that issue, but the plaintiff may recover his debt. There is no instance known in which the common law empannels a jury in the progress of a contest between two parties, to try a preliminary inquiry: either there is no jury or the decision is final. In this case it is clear that the order made by a commissioner, whether on a trial before a jury, or examination by himself, to deliver up the person claimed as a fugitive, decides nothing as between these persons when they get within the jurisdiction from which the fugitive escaped. There is the place for his action; there he may have his trial, and there, if the common law prevails, he has his trial by jury. The decision of the commissioner is not only not conclusive, but it is not even evidence; and why? because the examination is made for a preliminary object—to send the fugitive back to the State from which he escaped, leaving the tribunals of that State to try the question of freedom or Slavery. In other words, the constitution in both clauses meant this: that we should be so far one nation that the tribunals of every State should place implicit confidence in the justice of the decisions of the tribunals of every other State, and therefore, without any other inquiry than a *prima facie* examination, should remand to the States from which they escaped, fugitives from justice. But I wish to give a high authority to show that the constitution did not contemplate any trial on these cases, except such a one as takes place upon a preliminary inquiry on the surrender of a fugitive from justice. Justice Story remarks, in the clause immediately following that to which I called the attention of the Senate just now:

"It is obvious that these provisions for the arrest and removal of fugitives of both classes contemplate summary ministerial proceedings, and not the ordinary course of judicial investigations, to ascertain whether the complaints be well founded, or the claim of ownership be established beyond all legal controversy. In cases of suspected crimes the guilt or innocence of the party is to be made out at his trial, and not upon the preliminary inquiry whether he shall be delivered up. All that would seem in such cases to be necessary is, that there should be *prima facie* evidence before the executive authority to satisfy its judgment that there is probable cause to believe the party guilty; such as upon an ordinary warrant would justify his commitment for trial. And in the cases of fugitive slaves there would seem to be the same necessity of requiring only *prima facie* proofs of ownership, without putting the party to a formal assertion of his rights upon a trial. And, accordingly, in the statute upon this subject, have authorized summary proceedings before a magistrate, upon which he may grant a warrant for a removal."

Now, here is a statute which for half a century has, until a very recent period, been admitted by all hands to be perfectly within the scope of our authority under the constitution. Yet, for the purpose of agitation, for political and sectional purposes, and I may very properly add, for mischievous purposes, its constitutionality is to be brought in question; all respect for the uniform decisions of judicial tribunals to be thrown aside, and the whole matter is to be considered as if the constitution was adopted but yesterday—that we are now for the first time to fix its meaning. Yes, sir; and more than that. This enactment is to be met with every species of denunciatory words which the skill of the senator from Massachusetts can command, to vilify and abuse its character as an "outrage against God," a "violation of the ordinary principles of humanity"—a law identical, in these particulars, with the one which received the sanction of Washington and all the great patriots of the revolution.

The senator made a reference to the provision of the constitution in regard to trial by jury. It is sufficient to say that there is no case under the amendments of the constitution—and the constitution itself has no provision in regard to trial by jury in such cases as these. In all suits at law where the value in controversy shall exceed $20 the right of trial by jury shall be preserved. That is true; but this is not a suit at law in which a court has to pronounce upon the value of the property, if it were a question of property. There are only two cases in which the constitution alludes to trial by jury—cases of trial for crime, and cases of property exceeding in amount the sum of $20.

Now, the senator from Massachusetts, in the course of his remarks, has made a great many references to the opinions expressed and entertained many years ago by eminent Southern patriots and statesmen. He has called them Abolitionists. He applied the term Abolitionist to such a great and good man as George Washington. Sir, in the Senate in which that word is now used, it is impossible that a greater calumny could be perpetrated upon the memory of that great man than to call him an Abolitionist. In what sense was he an Abolitionist? Did he wage war upon Slavery? Did he seek to deprive men who owned slaves of their property? Did he seek to prevent the laws from being executed which were passed for the recovery of fugitive slaves? No, sir; never. When he came to make his arrangements for leaving this world, he did with his own slaves what he thought was right to do with them. He emancipated them, but not immediately and absolutely. He gave them to his widow during her life. Was he indifferent to the recovery of slaves when they escaped? No, sir; the very letter which the honourable senator from Massachusetts produced, when the whole of it was read at the Clerks desk, shows the contrary. His servant girl escaped from him. He was desirous of recovering her, and he wrote to a friend to aid in accomplishing that purpose for him. He desired his friend to seize her with as little previous notice as possible, and put her on board a vessel coming from Philadelphia to Alexandria; but he said he would rather lose the services of the negro altogether than to be the means, by the manner of her seizure, of creating a riot or a mob, or of producing any uneasy feelings in the minds of good citizens.

Mr. BAYARD. He was then President of the United States.

Mr. BADGER. As my friend from Delaware justly remarks, he was then President of the United States. He occupied such a position that the assertion of his private rights, which would have been justifiable in an individual, and might have been justifiable in him, would possibly have been unwise and impolitic. But he was touched with no principle or feeling of modern Abolitionism. Like many patriots of that day—and Jefferson was one of them—he entertained the idea that it would be practicable to abolish Slavery without injury to the Southern planter; and they looked forward, first, to a gradual amelioration, and then to a gradual extinction of the institution; but they confined themselves to their own bailiwicks; they proposed no invasion of the rights of others, either directly or indirectly. They were elevated far above such patriotism as that. What they spoke of was delivering from bondage their own slaves, not the slaves of others. The object they had in view was to consider whether, and how, and when they might, if at all, extend the boon of liberty to those who were then slaves; and when they came to their dying hours, if they thought proper to do so, directed that those slaves to be emancipated; not on the principle of modern Abolitionism, but as the voluntary act of the masters. Why, the lamented gentleman who two years ago, acted such a conspicuous part in procuring the passage of the law that the gentleman seeks by his amendment to repeal; who now rests in his grave; and who has surrendered his spirit to the God that gave it—by his last will and testament made provision for the emancipation of his slaves after the death of his widow. But was he an Abolitionist? Had he any sympathy with Abolitionists? Was he, because he chose to emancipate his own slaves, desirous of weakening the process by which other men might recover theirs? No, sir, he was entirely distinguished, in every respect, from the spirit of modern Abolitionism. Modern Abolitionism is a wanton and mischievous interference with the property of others. The Abolitionists of former days were men who sought to deal only with those matters which belonged to them; and those Abolition societies which existed in other States—in States where there were no slaves, or where Slavery had ceased to be a matter of any importance—sought not to put any compulsion on slave-owners. Did they not for many years have their State acts for the benefit of sojourners who passed through the country? Although the constitution extends no protection to the master who voluntarily transfers his slave into another jurisdiction where Slavery does not exist, yet for a long time the free States had no desire or disposition in any way to interfere with the rights or feelings of their southern brethren; and hence it was that they made provision to enable those who were sojourners among them to retain and carry home such slaves as they might bring with them for domestic service. Those men had no relationship with the spirit which influences Anti-Slavery and Abolition societies of the present day.

I have said, then, so far as this argument is concerned, that if we can place any reliance on the judicial administration of the constitution for half a century, and on the opinions of the most eminent men in the country respecting this clause of the constitution, it is a clause which confers power upon Congress to cause the restitution of fugitives from labour; that the act passed in 1793, and, by a necessary consequence, the act passed in 1850, are constitutional enactments, within the provision of that clause of the constitution of the United States, and, consequently, are entitled to respect and obedience by every man who deems himself subject to the laws of his country. I deal not at all with the proposition of the senator from Massachusetts, that every man must make up his mind as to how far he will obey the law; and that, if he conscientiously believes that he ought not to submit to it, he will be justified in resistance. All I have to say on that subject is, that every man must make up his mind to take that course at his own proper hazard, and secure himself beforehand for the accomplishment of his purpose, or make provision to secure himself from proper punishment; for there is the law, and unless we are prepared to have all judicial interpretation, all precedents, all acquiescence overturned at the dictation of societies which are seeking to destroy the slave institution in the States which now allow it and support it; unless we allow this long interpretation of the constitution for more than half a century to be overturned for purposes of mischief and inconvenience, we must do, as in prudence, common sense, and justice we ought to do—we must adhere to the interpretation which has been handed down to us from such high sources, and which has been unquestioned heretofore.

But the opinion of the senator from Massachusetts, accompanied by the strengthening and decorative matters which he has interwoven and thrown around it, so as to go before the public, and as he announces his own solemn conviction of the odious and abominable character of the law, I wish to call the attention of the Senate—as much depends in the value of an individual's opinion upon a question of this kind, upon how he may stand committed on the subject by former avowals—to what the honourable senator said elsewhere upon this subject. Three or four months ago I became aware, for the first time, of the contents of a speech made by the honourable senator at Boston, in October, 1850; and expecting that that subject might then or shortly afterwards be brought up for the consideration of the Senate, I got a friend of mine to transcribe certain passages from it, which I laid in my desk. These extracts were taken from two volumes, entitled "Orations and Speeches by CHARLES SUMNER." And this speech appears to have been delivered at the Free Soil State Convention, held at Boston, on October 3d, 1850. Here are several passages of it:

"And still further, as if to do a deed which should 'make Heaven weep, all earth amazed,' this same Congress, in disregard of all the cherished safeguards of freedom, has passed a most cruel, unchristian, devilish law, to secure the return into Slavery of these fortunate bondmen who have found shelter by our firesides." * * * A "detestable, Heaven-defying bill;" and mark once more its heathenism: by unrelenting provisions it visits with bitter penalties of fine and imprisonment the faithful men and women who may render to the fugitive that countenance, succour, and shelter which Christianity expressly requires. Thus, from beginning to end, it sets at naught the best principles of the Constitution, and the very laws of God!"

Again:

"But I will not pursue these details. The soul sickens in the contemplation of this legalized outrage. In the dreary annals of the past there are many acts of shame—there are ordinances of monarchs, and laws which have become a byword and a hissing to the nations. But when we consider the country and the age, I ask fearlessly what act of shame—what ordinance of monarch—what law can compare in atrocity with this enactment of an American Congress!"

Then, after furnishing some examples which the senator seems to think have been particularly remarkable for atrocity in past times, he says:

"I will not exaggerate."

Oh, no! of course; no exaggeration!

"I would not exaggerate. I wish to keep within bounds; but I think no person can doubt that the condemnation now affixed to these transactions and to their authors, must be the lot hereafter of the Fugitive Slave Bill, and of every one, according to the measure of his influence, who gave it his support. Into the immortal catalogue of national crimes this has now passed, drawing with it, by an inexorable necessity, its authors also, and chiefly him who, as President of the United States, set his name to the bill, and breathed into it that final breath without which it would have no life. Other Presidents may be forgotten, but the name signed to the Fugitive Slave Bill can never be forgotten. There are depths of infamy, as there are heights of fame. I regret to say what I must, but truth compels me. Better far for him had he never been born; better far for his memory, and for the good name of his children, had he never been President."

Mr. President, I shudder when I think of these expressions; because, if there be any truth in them, they are just as applicable to George Washington as they are to Millard Fillmore. George Washington's name is signed to a Fugitive Slave Law, liable to every objection applicable to this one signed by Millard Fillmore, and he is just as liable to these imputations. If Millard Fillmore is to be consigned to the lowest depths of infamy because he signed the last Fugitive Slave Law, then, if there is any justice or equality in the judgments of mankind, George Washington should receive the same fate from us and our posterity.

Again, sir, this speech goes on:

"Sir, I will not dishonour this home of the Pilgrims and of the Revolution, by admitting—nay, I cannot believe—that this bill will be executed here. Individuals among us, as elsewhere, may forget humanity in a fancied loyalty to law; but the public conscience will not allow a man, who has trodden our streets as a freeman, to be dragged away as a slave. By his escape from bondage he has shown that true manhood which must grapple to him every honest heart. He may be ignorant and rude as he is poor, but he is of true nobility. The fugitive slaves of the United States are among the heroes of our age. In sacrificing them to this foul enactment of Congress, we should violate every sentiment of hospitality, every whispering of the heart, every dictate of religion. There are many who will never shrink at any cost, and notwithstanding all the atrocious penalties of this Bill, from efforts to save a wandering fellow-man from bondage. They will offer him the shelter of their houses, and, if need be, will protect his liberty by force. But let me be understood; I counsel no violence."

Well, sir, after having described this law, and surrounded it with such terms of abuse and villification, both of the enactment itself and of its authors, as were well calculated to stir up the most heated and violent passions of his auditory, when, I suppose, he must have remarked it, he broke out like another orator:

"Good friends! sweet friends! let me not stir you up
To such a sudden flood of mutiny."

"The dial spoke not, but it made shrewd signs,
And pointed full upon the stroke of murder!"

If a man resist an officer charged with the execution of a process to arrest another, and in the resistance a conflict ensue, and blood is shed by the resisting party, is it not murder? Surely it is, sir. And, Mr. President, we have reason to understand what were the effects of this very speech in the State of Massachusetts. This speech was delivered on the 3d of October. In the month of February following, if I recollect aright, about the 15th of the month, occurred that disgraceful mob and outrage which sullied the fair character of the State, and of her distinguished capital city. How could it be expected that it should be otherwise? Here were distinct notifications that it was an act of "virtue" to protect by "force" these fugitive slaves; and if it would be "an act of virtue" to "protect them by force," surely virtuous men would be excused for performing such an act of "virtue." If it was a meritorious deed, surely they might perform it, although he who prescribed it said that he counselled no violence.

Again, sir:

"From a humane, just, and religious people shall spring a public opinion, to keep perpetual guard over the liberties of all within our borders. Nay, more, like the flaming sword of the cherubim at the gates of Paradise, turning on every side, it shall prevent any slave-hunter from ever setting foot in this Commonwealth. Elsewhere he may pursue his human prey; he may employ his congenial bloodhounds and exult in his successful game; but into Massachusetts he must not come. And yet, again I say, I counsel no violence. I would not touch his person. Not with whips and thongs would I scourge him from the land. The contempt, the indignation, the abhorrence of the community shall be our weapons of offence."

Then, again:

"Yes, settled—settled—that is the word. Nothing, sir, can be settled which is not right. Nothing can be settled which is adverse to freedom. Nothing can be settled which is contrary to the precepts of Christianity, God, Nature, and all the holy sentiments of the heart, repudiate any such false seeming sentiment."

Again, sir:

"I am not blind to the adverse signs. The wave of reaction, which during the past year swept over Europe, has reached our shores. The very carriers of human rights have been broken down. Statesmen, writers, scholars, speakers, once their uncompromising professors, have become the professors of compromise. All this must be changed. Reaction must be stayed. The country must be aroused. The cause must again be pressed with the avowed purpose never to moderate our efforts until crowned with success."

Thus, sir, in calling attention to the progress of the public mind "settling down," and becoming "quiet," and being disposed to have a compromise of this agitating subject, and to acquiesce in the adjustment that has been made of it, what says the honourable senator?

"All this must be changed. The country must be aroused. The cause must again be pressed, with the avowed purpose never to moderate our efforts until crowned by success."

Then, again, sir, in the same speech, he informs us what it was that they required at the hands of Congress:

"We demand, first and foremost, the instant repeal of the Fugitive Slave Bill.

"We demand the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia.

"We demand the exercise by Congress in all Territories of its time-honoured power to prohibit Slavery.

"We demand of Congress to refuse to receive into the Union any new slave States.

"We demand the abolition of the domestic slave trade, so far as it can be constitutionally reached; but particularly on the high seas under the national flag. And generally, we demand from the Federal Government the exercise of all its constitutional power to relieve itself from responsibility for Slavery. And yet one thing further must be done. The slave power must be overturned, so that the Federal Government may be put openly, actively, and perpetually on the side of freedom."

Now, the honourable senator here, evidently alarmed at the prospect of this agitation subsiding, of the disposition to "compromise" and "acquiesce," announces that that state of things must be "changed," that the public mind must be "aroused," and that one of the first things they must demand of Congress was the instant repeal of the fugitive slave law. It was not to be allowed to remain, but was to be repealed instantly. Now, putting these two things together, I will read the passage of the speech which induced me to suppose—indeed I never had any doubt of it—that the honourable senator stood pledged to himself, as I think he did to the public at large, to press, when he came here, the immediate repeal of that law:

"A conviction of the disloyalty of the whig party to freedom, and an ardent aspiration to contribute something to the advancement of this great cause, led me to leave that party, and to dedicate what of strength and ability I could command to the present movement."

The present movement was, among other things, to procure an instant repeal of the fugitive slave law. The gentleman, satisfied, as he said, of the disloyalty of the Whig party of Massachusetts, or the Union—I do not know which—to freedom; that is to say, their opposition to the instantaneous repeal of the fugitive slave law and other kindred measures—for he did not mean that they desired to make themselves or their children slaves or to make white people slaves—being satisfied of Whig disloyalty to the cause of freedom, and being exceedingly desirous to promote "the present movement"—and what that was he had just explained—he had been induced to abandon that party, and to devote whatever of strength and energy he had to the success of the cause—"never to moderate his efforts till crowned with success." What was the result? After long-continued ballotings, he was elected to the Senate by a coalition, as generally understood and believed, of the national Democratic party of Massachusetts and the Free Soil party; and now I put it to you, sir, and to the Senate, whether the fair explanation of all that, and his subsequent election, is not that he stood pledged to the principles that he then avowed, and to press on Congress the instantaneous repeal of the fugitive slave law? Why, to be sure he did. He did not say it in so many words; he could scarcely do so, for he was not a senator at that time. He could not have said, I will, as soon as I get to the Senate, do this; but he said we must demand this repeal. The public mind is getting a little satisfied and settled; we must stir it up; we must put an end to its apathy; we must restore the reign of agitation, and call on Congress for the instant repeal of the law. I have quit the Whig party, and have devoted myself to your organization here, for the purpose of carrying out those plans. Is not that the substance of what he said? If they are all bound to them and the instantaneous repeal of the fugitive slave law, must they not seek for it in particular places and localities, and with the particular means placed at their command? If a senator of the United States thinks that it is his duty to demand of Congress the instantaneous repeal of the fugitive slave law, I pray you, sir, how can he demand it except by moving it? It would be absurd for him to present a petition to the Senate praying that it would take into consideration a measure for its repeal. He is a member of the Senate, and he does not petition with regard to measures of public utility; he is a member; he has a voice here. Therefore, I say that in substance the charge—which I never supposed the gentleman would venture to deny—is in substance made out that he was sent here to agitate for the repeal of the fugitive slave law, and that he came here pledged to do so. He came in the month of December, but we heard nothing of this instantaneous repeal of this "Heaven-defying," "soul-sickening law," this "horrible atrocity," this "damnable crime," this "exceeding wickedness," surpassing all the perfidy of all the acts of former tyrants. The gentleman sat perfectly quiet, and we heard of no movement being made until largely in the month of July. Now, for what purpose is that amendment offered here? What good end is it to subserve? Does the gentleman expect to get the law repealed? Or does he propose by this public discussion—if there should have been any disposition among his constituents in the State of Massachusetts to settle down once again after the former agitation into quiet and obedience to the laws of their country—does the senator mean by this speech to stir them up again to resistance? In his speech here to-day in denunciation of the fugitive slave law there is no qualifying phrase that he counsels no resistance. He has got beyond that point. In his speech in 1850, although violent in his denunciations, he was yet disposed to moderate the wrath of his hearers—he "counselled no violence;" but to-day we have the denunciation of the law and its authors—we have the expression of his recent belief that it is not binding upon the conscience, because it is a violation of the constitution of the United States and of the law of God; but we have no intimation at all to-day that resistance is to be by public opinion, and therefore we have in substance the old oration, without the qualifying clause.

This speech, Mr. President, is well calculated to stir up the people of Massachusetts. They look to the honourable senator for direction and guidance; they consider him a "marvellous proper man;" and, availing himself of his influence over them, he delivers himself of such a tirade of abuse upon the law of his own country—a law passed by this very Senate, in which he knows there are many gentlemen who voted for, and still support, that law—as is calculated, if any one lent a moment's credence to what he says, to cover us with scorn. For what pupose is it done? Did the senator do it to insult the members of this body? Did he do it to insult the memory of the dead—of George Washington, James Madison, and their compatriots—one of whom signed and the others aided in passing the fugitive slave law of 1793? Did the senator do it to answer any wise or good purpose? Does he hope to accomplish anything except to stir up sedition at home against this law, and make the streets of Boston again the scene of disgraceful riots and lawless violepce by the lawless opposers of the constitution and laws of the United States? Never, sir, since I have been a member of this body, has the Senate witnessed such an exhibition. I have sometimes heard speeches here which have, I confess, caused me deep regret; but this wholesale and revolting denunciation of a public law, and the epithets applied to it and to every person connected with the passing of it, is without example in our past history, and I trust in God it will never be followed in future. Yes, Mr. President, the honourable senator tells us in that speech at Boston that he has made a great sacrifice in consequence of his devotion to the Abolition cause. He has, sir, in several particulars. In the first place, he tells us that he abandoned the Whig party because they were not true to freedom. Party associations, Mr. President, are sometimes strong, and it is generally a considerable sacrifice to a man to part company with those with whom he has been long associated. That is the result of the social nature of man, and therefore it was a great sacrifice for him to tear himself away from the Whig party. The next sacrifice which he made was, as he informed us to-day—at least I infer it from what he informed us—his sacrifice of private considerations to take a seat in this body. His real desire, according to his statement to day, was not to be sent to the Senate of the United States. All he wished was to have inscribed upon his tomb an epitaph something like the following: "Here lies a man who, though he never held a public office, did some good in his day and generation." Yes sir, he quit his quiet home; he reluctantly agreed to come here to enlighten our darkness.

It is a pity, Mr. President, that the friends of the senator should have pressed so unpleasant a duty upon him; and I think the public generally will be satisfied and his constituents among the number, that the senator was a great deal better acquainted with the sort of life that would suit him, from which he would derive honour, and in which he might obtain that kind of fame of which he has spoken, had he not come here and devoted his energies to the instruction of this public body!

But, Mr. President, he has made a greater sacrifice than that; and I know he must have felt that to be a deep one. He has degraded himself by taking a seat upon this floor as the equal of men whom he has denounced in effect, in his speech, as being infamous. How humiliating it must have been to the feelings of the senator from Massachusetts to sink himself so low! And how high and overpowering must have been these claims of duty to Abolition societies which induced him to encounter such a dreadful shock to his feelings! Yes, sir, here is what he says of this act. He calls it a most cruel, unchristian, detestable, Heaven-defying bill, the passage of which should make Heaven weep and the whole earth amazed; a foul enactment, the legalized outrage, at the contemplation of which the soul sickens; an act of shame exceeding in atrocity all those acts of shame and all those ordinances of monarchs which have become a byword and a hissing to the nations of the earth; that their condemnation is now fixed upon this bill; that the fate of these by-laws which have become a hissing to the nations, must be the lot hereafter of the fugitive slave law; and the fate of these monarchs, the fate of every man according to the measure of his influence, who gave his support to that law, which has passed into the immortal catalogue of national crime, drawing with it by an inexorable necessity its authors also; and chiefly him who, as President of the United States, set his name to the bill; thus consigning him to the deepest depths of infamy. If the honourable senator is sincere in the statement contained in that speech, he then, must believe—for it seems to me that these are almost the very identical words which he used—that all who engaged in passing this bill, or who lent their assistance to its passage, are infamous in proportion to their activity and influence in that respect; and to the chief place, the lowest depths of infamy, he assigns the President of the United States who signed it. If the senator is sincere in that, he must necessarily believe that those of us here who voted for that bill are "infamous persons," and that he should feel himself degraded and ashamed at being associated with us in this body; and if he does not believe that, then all I have to say is, that a decent respect for the usages of this body forbids me to say what is the appropriate epithet by which to describe the man who wrote and published that speech. But this I will say, that if the senator said what I have read and did not believe it—if he did not believe that we were the infamous persons whom he held us up to be to the world at large—men with whom he might feel some degradation to be associated—then I appeal to him, whether we would not have a right, per contra and on the second supposition, to have something of the same feelings in regard to associating with him.

Mr. President, I have said that I thought this agitation was got up and maintained for mischievous purposes. I do not suppose, nor do I pretend, that all the persons concerned in it are bad men. Not at all. But I think the purposes, however they may regard them—certainly with many of the leaders of the party—are mischievous. They cannot have any hope or expectation of abolishing Slavery in the United States. The honourable senator from Massachusetts alluded to-day to the fable which assigned the expulsion of serpents from Ireland to St. Patrick; and, sir, that senator by his efforts to-day, and his efforts elsewhere, is just as certain to abolish Slavery from the United States as St. Patrick expelled the serpents from Ireland. Mr. President, if these persons would think at all—if they would entertain any other except this "one idea" in their minds—they would know—admitting everything they say as to the desirableness of abolishing Slavery—that it is utterly impracticable. They and their societies are oppressed now by the comparatively few people of colour they have among them, and to talk about the abolition of Slavery in the South, with three millions of slaves among us who would have in such case to live in a degraded state of freedom, is to talk of what no sane man believes to be possible, and which no sane man believes to be desirable, if it were possible; because the whole of society would be upturned, and what is felt to be an evil in the free States would be to us utter ruin and destruction. Whatever, therefore, may be thought about this institution—whatever opinions gentlemen may form—it exists among us to an extent and in a form that cannot be dealt with by our Abolition friends; and we must be content, and gentlemen of the North must be content to let us struggle on with the evil as best we may.

But the senator from Massachusetts has furnished me with an answer to the whole of his denunciation of the fugitive slave law, and of the persons concerned in passing it. That gentleman, as the Senate will recollect, made several speeches on a land bill some months ago. One of them was published under the title, "justice to the land States;" and in that speech, in reply to the senator from Kentucky [Mr. Underwood], he made use of this expression: "That safe resource of a weak cause—hard words and the imputation of personal motives." Sir, if any cause can be demonstrated to be bad by the use of hard words and the imputation of personal motives, and of infamy in others, it is the cause which that senator supported in his speech in October, 1850, and which he has supported here to-day. There is scarcely an epithet calculated to convey reproach in every varied form that the gentleman has not resorted to, not only in the speech made at the Free Soil convention, but written down, calmly and deliberately, and published, as I suppose, under his own superintendence and supervision. Making no allowances for the differences of opinion that others may entertain, making no allowance for the honesty of the convictions of others, he pronounces all engaged in the passage of this law to be steeped in infamy, and consigns the President of the United States to the detestation of posterity for having signed it. Now, if it is possible that the senator's own wise maxim can apply to any case, if it is possible that it is worth anything, it proves that his own cause is a weak and bad one, or else it would not be necessary to vilify and abuse the living, and to utter what in effect is an assault on the memory of the dead.

Mr. WELLER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to amend.

Mr. DODGE, of Iowa, then addressed the Senate. [His remarks were published in the *Union* of the 19th instant.]

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

†‡† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1852

MR. SUMNER'S SPEECH.

A FORTNIGHT ago we endeavoured, in all candour, but with all kindness, to give our sense of the merits of the question which has been stirred for months past, by his friends and enemies, as to the policy of Mr. Sumner's delay of his Speech against the Fugitive Slave Act. But that delay, though we have not yet ceased regretting it, is over. The Speech has been made. It has entered almost every house in the Free States and has overleaped the barrier which would shut out every word tainted with the breath of Freedom from the ears of the dwellers in the Slave States themselves. It is doing its perfect work. The question now arises, what that work is and how perfect it may be. Its work must be good to the extent that its plan goes. It cannot be that a rhetorical performance of the eminent merit of this Speech, informed as it is with a genuine hatred of Slavery, and setting in array against it the countless multitude of its crimes and of its insolences, it cannot be that such a production should not widely and deeply influence the minds of great multitudes of men. Such a spirit cannot move over the face deep of a Nation's mind, and leave it void and formless as before. Mr. Sumner has helped to sweep away whole webs of sophistries which the devilish malignity of profligate politicians had spun around the infernal work of their hands, and has shown it as it really is. He has assisted, most ably, in putting to flight whole troops of Shams and Delusions, so cunning of Device that it seemed as if they might deceive, to the extent they claimed, the very elect.

Mr. Sumner's Speech, together with Mr. Rantoul's, Mr. Mann's, and the other able utterances which have illustrated this Congress, has supplied even the humblest hater of the Slave Act with a reason for the Faith that is in him. The necessity of the passage of some such Act by Congress, and the duty of obeying it until it is repealed, are both equally blown to the winds. The unconstitutionality of the Fugitive Act has been demonstrated as clearly as any legal or moral problem can be. The Constitution has been cleared of this "damned spot" which those who would make it the bare tool of their ambitious lusts have striven to make cleave to its skirts. The great masses of the people, who are still in bondage to the parchment, and who think that all its legitimate issues must be of divine effect, have been shown that the Constitution is as innocent as the sheep on whose skin it is engrossed, of the particular wickedness that sought shelter under its shadow. This is good. This is well. But how far is it from striking at the root of the evil tree! It is only shifting the iniquity, and the responsibility for it, from one set of men's shoulders to another. It is only carrying the Little Hunchback from the Jew doctor's door to the Christian merchant's. The ghastly lump of deformity is the same; it is only set down in another street. The Slaves, and the American Anti-Slavery Society as their next friend, do not complain merely that a man who has succeeded in repossessing himself of his own body and soul, should be thrust down again into hell by the arm of the General Government. They aver that it is a crime of the most horrid dye, let it be done by whom it may. It is the blow aimed at the life's life of the Slave that we protest against—not the hand, merely, that deals it

Mr. Sumner treats with fine scorn the new-fangled vocabulary of Pro-Slavery, by which Slavery is made National and Liberty Sectional. But we do not think he has made out his case, to the full extent of his claim. The framers of the Constitution, undoubtedly, did not foresee how Slavery was destined to overshadow the whole land, and would be at a loss to understand the language of the special Sons of Liberty of this day; but they did recognise and protect property in Slaves to the extent of forbidding any State to make laws for the security and freedom of escaping slaves, and for their rendition on claims, to say nothing of the prohibition of the Abolition of the Slave Trade for twenty years, a clause under which it may be revived at any time. It seems to us a distinction without a difference to say that property in man is not recognised by the Constitution as much as the right of the citizen of one State to enjoy all the rights of Citizenship in every other State. The right of the master to his slave is as much a National right as the right of Mr. Hoar to go to Charleston, South Carolina, to commence an action at law, to try a question of personal freedom. All that the Constitution says, or implies, in either case, is, that the States shall make *no* laws infringing upon these rights, and *shall* make all laws necessary to secure them. The Constitution is utterly set at nought by South Carolina when its clause for securing the rights of Northern men interferes with Slavery. Will the time never come when Massachusetts will do as much in behalf of Liberty? We hope that it will come, and that speedily; but when it does come, its coming will sweep over the ruins of the Constitution—ruins from which a fairer edifice than our Fathers knew how to build, shall arise.

Mr. Sumner says, "for myself, I know no better aim, under the Constitution, than to bring the Government back to the precise position on this question which it occupied on the auspicious morning of its first organization under Washington; that the sentiments of the Fathers may again prevail with our rulers, and that the National Flag may nowhere shelter Slavery." Well, perhaps, there is no "better aim," *under the Constitution*, that a public man can take. But what an aim it is! An aim directed just as *point-blank* at the heart of the Slave as the Fugitive Slave Act itself, only made with a different weapon and from a different stand. For what was the position of the Fathers on the thirtieth of April, 1789, when Washington swore to maintain the Constitution of the United States? Mr. Sumner does not deny, as we understand him, that there was "*a Compact*" between the States then united into a Nation, that Fugitive Slaves should be restored to their owners. Well, that was a Compact meant to be observed, we apprehend, and not to be broken. The States, for certain accruing advantages, agreed with one another to do certain specific things, one of which was that "persons owing service and labour, &c., shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service and labour may be due." The only question, we conceive, between Mr. Rantoul and Mr. Sumner, and Commissioners' Curtis and Ingraham, is, as to who shall provide the process for this restoration. These latter oracles maintaining (on the authority of the Supreme Court in the Prigg case) that this power is Constitutionally vested in Congress, while the former gentlemen most impregnably establish the position that it was an article of Compact to be executed in the States themselves.

But, either by Nation or State, this clause is to be made operative. Does Mr. Sumner deny this? We think not. We consider the Free States stand towards the Slave States as to the matter of the rendition of Slaves, as the United States do towards England as to the extradition of criminals. The Fugitive Slave Law is as gross an insult to the Free States as would be an Act of Parliament providing process for the arrest and recovery of felons in the United States; and the attempts at its execution are as outrageous assaults on their rights as would be an attempt to seize Kaine or Meagher (supposing, in the last case, treason to have been included among the crimes enumerated in the Treaty) by a British force. But still, the process necessary for the due execution of the Treaty on the one hand, and of the Compact on the other, must be provided by the competent authorities. Felons are to be returned to England and Slaves to Georgia. Supposing it were unanimously granted that this was an Article of Compact, and that Legislation on the part of the States was necessary to carry it into effect, is not such necessary Legislation to be had? Does not good faith demand it? Would Mr. Sumner have this clause defeated by the inaction or the treacherous action of the Legislatures of the Free States? If he would, how does he reconcile his opinion with his obligation to support the Constitution? And how, in such case, could he blame the Slaveholding States for seceding on the ground that the Compact was broken?

But we suppose Mr. Sumner and the Free Soil party, generally, admit that the Constitution *does* require the rendition of *Slaves*. What they are reduced, in the last analysis, to contend for, is, that such a process shall be provided as shall secure any *freeman* from being taken as a Slave. Now, this does not satisfy us, for it is very far from satisfying our clients, the Slaves. We objected to the redition of Thomas Sims not because he *was not* a SLAVE, but because he WAS A MAN! Let Mr. Sumner draw up the law of Massachusetts that is to carry out this Compact; let him hedge round the man claimed with every bulwark of common law; let him be tried before the full Bench of the Supreme Court, by a Special Jury; let counsel be furnished and his witnesses be paid by the State; let every possible impediment be interposed between the slave-hunter and his prey; and if, after all, the jury is compelled by the force of evidence to find that the defendant is a Slave, is he not to go back to his master? We do not see how Mr. Sumner can help answering *yes!* But we say No!! A thousand times, NO!!! Perish the Union, perish the Constitution, first!

But this is a topic for a volume not an article. We may return to it.—E. Q.

LIBERTY PARTY CONVENTION.—In accordance with the Call for a Convention, which we published two or three weeks since, the Liberty Party assembled at Syracuse on the 30th ultimo. The Telegraph reports that they had a somewhat stormy session, but this we presume only means that they discussed with a good deal of earnestness what, under the circumstances of the times, it behooved them to do. The result of their deliberations was the nomination of Mr. Goodell for President, and S. M. Piper, of Virginia, for Vice President. We hope Mr. Piper will carry his State. Gerrit Smith is reported as advocating the nominations; but we learn from a gentleman who was present at the Convention, that he announced his intention of casting his vote for Hale and Julian, but was nevertheless anxious that the Liberty Party should preserve its identity, that its members might have something to fall back upon in case of accident. If this statement be correct, it is not impossible that some feeling may have existed in the Convention, and perhaps have manifested itself, in some degree, on the question upon whom the duty of maintaining the existence of the party devolved. Those willing to assume it may object to its falling upon them alone, and be disposed to presume that, if it be a duty at all, it is one that belongs alike to all members of the Liberty Party. It is certainly a convenient policy—and one which the *Tribune* and its friends are trying among the Whigs, and the *Post* and its friends among the Democrats—to hold on to a larger party which is popular, and leave to other people to maintain a smaller and unpopular one, till it is large and promising enough to make it worth their while to join it; but whether it be not a policy which serves in a measure to defeat the event hoped for, is a point on which a great deal may be said in the affirmative. With the Liberty Party especially it is likely to prove a dangerous experiment

THE JERRY RESCUE ANNIVERSARY.

THIS occasion passed off, we learn, not only quietly, but with great satisfaction to all concerned. The meeting was crowded, the audience attentive and interested, and the speaking of a high order. Such a result was, no doubt, unexpected to a portion of the citizens of Syracuse, unless

there is no attribute of man—true, unperverted, undebased man—"which can take side with 'the slaveholder' in such a contest;" but that every sentiment and sympathy of his soul must be on the side of the oppressed.

9. Resolved, That our oaths to support the Federal Constitution, no less than our higher and holier obligations to be true to the Constitution of our Common Humanity, and obedient to the laws of God, require that we should set at naught an enactment which despotically suspends "the writ of Habeas Corpus," withholds "the trial by jury" in the most momentous of all cases that can arise between man and man, and peremptorily forbids, under heavy pains and penalties, the free exercise of the vital principles of religion. These rights, sacredly and jealously guarded and guaranteed, as well by the letter of the American Constitution as by the spirit of the age that gave it birth, are all outraged by the Act of September 18th, 1851—and therefore that Act should be regarded and treated by every true man *as no law*, but as a despotic decree, which we should despise and trample upon, come what may to our property or our lives.

9. Resolved, That while we regret the action of the Mayor and majority of the Common Council of the City of Syracuse, in refusing to us the use of the City Hall and of all the public grounds, for this celebration, and regard it as an assumption which can not be justified in those who are set to watch over and defend impartially the rights of all classes of citizens, among which is the right peaceably to assemble and freely to speak out all they may think and feel respecting any doctrine or measure of the Church or the State, we regard their action on their account more than our own, clearly foreseeing that the time will come when their cheeks will burn with shame in the remembrance that they thus gave aid and comfort to the oppressors of God's poor and to the tyrants of their country.

The Committee also reported the following resolutions on business, which were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That we are happy to be able to announce to the public that the proceedings in the trial of Deputy Marshal Allen, for kidnapping Jerry, are at last published; and that the pamphlet containing them, and also much other valuable matter, can be purchased of Seth Haight, in Syracuse, for six dollars and a quarter for fifty copies.

Resolved, That this Convention do now proceed to contribute to the "Jerry Fund"—this being the fund which is relied on to defray the very great expenses already incurred in defending the friends of liberty and law against the persecutions of our Slavery-controlled Government.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted.

Miss LUCY STONE addressed the meeting at some length in glorification of the Rescue.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS followed in a speech of considerable length in justification of the Rescue, and an examination into the claims to respect and observance of the "Higher Law."

"The Slave Catcher," by the Rev. John Pierpont, was sung by the meeting.

When, at 1 o'clock P. M., the meeting adjourned to 3 P. M.

We should judge that at the adjournment there were twenty-five hundred or three thousand persons in the House.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

There were estimated to be about thirty-five hundred or more persons in the house at the opening.

A song, entitled "Duty of the Free," was sung by the assemblage.

Mr. NOBLE, one of the Vice Presidents, took the chair, and announced a speech by Gerrit Smith.

Mr. SMITH took the stand, and was greeted with three cheers. He proceeded in a lengthy argument, justifying the Rescue as an act of right and justice. During his remarks, prolonged cheers were given for the Rescue, and to the question—"Would we, the Rescuers of Jerry, perform the same act again?" put by him to the audience, there was a general response of "Yes" and cheers. The speaker closed by urging that this celebration should be made an annual occurrence, until the extinguishment of Slavery in the country.

The PRESIDENT introduced William Lloyd Garrison, who addressed the meeting in a very long speech. He regarded the Rescue as an act of unprecedented importance in the history of the world. In alluding to the attendance at the celebration, he enumerated God, the Son of God, the glorified spirits in Heaven and the thousands of friends throughout the country, and the 3,200,000 slaves on the Southern plantations in spirit and sympathy. He justified at much length the rescue of Jerry. He examined and commented upon the action of the Baltimore Conventions. He discussed a variety of topics having connexion with the cause of the celebration.

Mr. WHEATON offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the thanks of this meeting be very gratefully tendered to John Wilkinson, Esq., for his promptness and generosity in opening this spacious building for our use on this momentous occasion.

The song, "Come join the Abolitionists," was sung, and a contribution taken up in aid of the "Jerry Fund."

Mrs. LUCRETIA MOTT was introduced by the President. She reminded the meeting that while they rejoiced in the rescue of one person from bondage, they should not forget the millions who are yet in Slavery. She briefly examined the difference in the attitude of the opponents of Slavery at this day, and compared their position to that of the Anti-Slavery men of the early days of the movement. She argued at some length in favour of the non-resisting principle, and against forcible opposition to the Fugitive Slave Law.

The PRESIDENT said he had gratifying information from Jerry, who was in Kingston, Canada, and honourably employed. Last week he sent a cane to C. A. Wheaton, which he (Mr. S.) held in his hand. He then announced the hour of adjournment, and made some proper closing remarks.

The Doxology was sung.

A benediction was pronounced by Rev. C. P. Grosvenor.

The meeting then adjourned *sine die*.

The afternoon session was much better attended than the morning, and we should think there were at least five thousand persons present.

STATE MEETING OF THE FREE DEMOCRACY.

THE Free Democracy of this State assembled in Convention, at Syracuse, on the 29th ult., and, as far as we can learn, had a very good time of it. No special report has reached us, and we are indebted to the Telegraphic Dispatches to the Daily press for all we know of it. The following was its list of officers:

Lyman Clary, of Onondago, President; C. B. LeBaron, of New York, W. H. Williams, of Westchester, G. Van Horzen, of Rensellaer, James Reddington, of St. Lawrence, G. T. Case, of Oswego, Street Dutton, of Delaware, S. C. Cuyler, of Wayne, ——— Bushnell, of Orleans, Vice Presidents; Messrs. Stewart Church, and H. A. Smith, of Chautauque, Secretaries.

The Business Committee reported this series of Resolutions, which were all unanimously adopted:

Whereas, It is proper and incumbent upon all political parties organized for permanent existence and for pratical purposes to make a distinct declaration of the principles and objects they seek to promote, both in reference to questions of National and State policy; and

Whereas, The Free Democracy being so organized, and having, at their late Pittsburgh Convention, made such declaration of its great principles and objects as respects its National policy, which declaration is by this Convention adopted, ratified, and approved, whereby it only remains to this Convention to indicate the position of the party upon questions effecting the interests of our great State; therefore,

Resolved, 1. That the Free Democracy demand the Constitutional right of trial by jury to all persons of whatever colour or condition, on all questions affecting personal liberty.

2. That proper laws be passed forbidding the use of the prisons and the other property of the State, and prohibiting the interference of any officer of the State, for any purpose inconsistent with the rights and liberties of the whole people without discrimination.

3. That laws be passed for testing the Constitutionality of any law of the General Government, which in anywise encroaches upon the reserved or Constitutional rights of the people, and especially of the Fugitive Slave Law, and that in the meantime such rights be adequately protected from threatened invasion.

4. That the true source of all greatness and happiness of any State, as well as the only true security of liberty, lies in the virtue and intelligence of the people; therefore the encouragement of general education, with laws for the protection of the public morals, while guarding against sectarian and political or social discrimination, should become the first and constant care of the State.

5. That the tillers of the soil should become its owners; that to that end the State should, in every constitutional way, seek to perfect titles to land within the State, and to convert leasehold estates into estates in fee, having respect always to the vested rights of the parties thereto.

The Convention then proceeded to nominate a ticket for State officers, which resulted as follows: For Governor, MINTHORNE TOMPKINS; For Lieutenant Governor, SETH M. GATES; for Canal Commissioner, Charles A. Wheaton; for State Prison Inspector, Geo. Curtis; for Electors at Large, Hiram Barney and Alfred Babcock.

A full District Electoral Ticket was also nominated, as follows:

Dist.		*Dist.*	
1	Herman B. Cropsey,	17	Wm. B. Stebbins,
2	Charles W. Lynn,	18	Ellis Bee,
3	Wm. S. Underhill,	19	Isaac S. Ford,
4	Samuel Leeds,	20	Merrit Peckham,
5	John B. Wells,	21	John D. Sawyer,
6	Alonzo S. Ball,	22	Geo. Salmon,
7	Chas. Henzein,	23	Ichabod Thompson,
8	Thos. S. Berry,	24	Nathan Soule,
9	Wm. Jay,	25	John J. Wilson,
10	Chas. Gregg,	26	Melancthon Lewis,
11	None,	27	Frederick O. Rogers,
12	Calvert Canfield,	28	Geo. Smith,
13	Lewis Crandall,	29	—— Roswell,
14	Wm. J. Ross,	30	Charles O. Shephard,
15	Leonard Gibbs,	31	Peter Murphy,
16	Noahsiah More,	32	Asa Warren,
	33	Wm	H. Zew.

Mr Tompkins, on being introduced to the Convention, briefly addressed it. He had, he said, "great aversion to assuming the responsibility and cares of public office, though he did not now feel in special danger of them. This was not the time to falter, and he could not refuse the use of his name to the Free Democracy for any purpose. In 1840, he left the State Senate because he would not consent to censure, with the Democracy, those members of Congress who voted to sustain the right of petition, and he had never regretted the act. He fully endorsed the platform of the Pittsburgh Convention, and said, 'I will stand by the Free Democracy while I live—so help me God.' He said he was not prepared to make a speech, but would give his views to the public more fully hereafter."

The nomination of Mr. Tompkins will doubtless be a very popular one, and command the full vote of his party. It is probable, moreover, that it will attract to their standard many of the Democrats who hang loosely upon their old party connections, as his name alone is one which will ensure enthusiasm. He is a son of the late Daniel D. Tompkins, the most popular Governor the State ever had, one of the most distinguished men she has produced, and Vice President of the United States under the administration of Munroe.

Since the nomination of Van Buren by the Free Soil Party, at the last Presidential election, Mr. Tompkins has, we believe, identified himself with that party; he is, at any rate, well known in this city, in the neighbourhood of which he resides, for his earnest denunciation of the Fugitive Slave Law.

THE ROMANCE OF SLAVERY.—No writer of fiction, not even of Anti-Slavery fiction, would venture so far upon the credulity of readers as to relate as possible or probable many of the tales which those who are conversant with the experiences of fugitive slaves know to be facts. Indeed, persons not thus conversant are evidently compelled to summon all their faith in the veracity of personal friends who may sometimes relate incidents which may have come under their personal observation. Were the many striking cases of this character, which are known to transpire, told, and should they be generally believed, if they did not make everybody Abolitionists, they would create a degree of sympathy with the fugitive slave, and of indignation against the Fugitive Slave Law, which would render it impossible that it should be executed. But the world probably will not hear of many of them, or, at any rate, will not believe them, till the work which they might do now is accomplished by other means. When that time comes, and this new field is opened to literature, imagination will be at discount. The novel-writer will only have to consult some musty old file of Anti-Slavery newspapers, or possess himself of the notes of some Isaac T. Hopper, to have his work almost ready made to his hands.

An incident of the sort we allude to is related in the *Voice of the Fugitive*, an able Anti-Slavery paper, published in Canada, and edited by Henry Bibb, a well-known fugitive slave. A similar story, in its results, told by Mrs. Stowe, in Uncle Tom's Cabin, is by many persons, no doubt, considered a very improbable exaggeration of one of the evils of Slavery. Mr. Bibb's statement is as follows:

JUST ESCAPED FROM SLAVERY.

The broad Lakes and Rivers which have so long rolled between us and our bereft brothers, who were dragged away in early life, by the American slaveholders, and the improbability of their escape from the extreme South to Canada, had almost extinguished the last lingering of hope in us that we should ever meet again on the shores of time: but on last Wednesday morning we had the good fortune to meet three of our dear brothers, fresh from our old master's prison-house. The pleasure which it gives us to be able to make this announcement is "unspeakable and full of joy." They left Albert G. Sibley and family, who has long lived upon their unrequited toil, without a single slave to black their boots or cultivate their fields. This leads us to remember the sublime sentence of Watts, that

"God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform;
He plants his footsteps on the sea
And rides upon the storm."

Yes, during the last 48 hours, Sibley's heart has been filled with grief over the loss of slaves, while a mother's and brother's hearts have been made to leap with joy at the redemption of the same persons, with whom they can now rejoice in a land of freedom. In 1836, Sibley separated our mother from six of her children, five of whom he carried to the State of Missouri, leaving the mother in Kentucky. After he had arrived in Missouri, he sold three of the above slaves to different persons, and still kept two of them until within a few days, when they escaped to Canada. Granville, the eldest of these brothers, whom Sibley had sold, and sent off a distance of 200 miles, escaped from his owner in the month of December, 1851, and travelled the whole 200 miles through the unbroken forest. His way was guided alone by the north star at night, and the sun by day, until he had reached again the plantation of Sibley, where he found his two younger brothers. He kept concealed about the plantation for several days, with a view of bringing off his two brothers, but for some cause they could not get ready to start just then, and he started on his journey with the understanding that he should stop for them at a certain place in the State of Illinois, until they came up. This was on the line of the underground railroad, so that it was almost impossible for them to miss the way. Granville came to the stopping-place according to promise, and there waited several months for his brothers, but they came not until after he had left; but they soon followed closely in his footsteps to Canada. In proof of this we will give a little incident which happened on their way. After Granville left Sibley's plantation, on his way he had occasion to cross a large prairie; when he got about half way across it, he had occasion to stop, where he lost a large Jack-knife; and there was no road or broken track—and yet as the other two came across in the same direction they found their brother's knife, and recognised it, and brought it on to him in Canada, and within less than three days after Granville arrived here, the other two arrived also and found their brother—all of whom passed through Windsor, without knowing that they had a single relative in Canada, much less in Windsor.

The circumstances of our being brought together in Canada are rather peculiar, not having seen each other for about sixteen years, and the younger brothers were then quite small: yet on last Wednesday we met one of our brothers on the Ferry boat, and, after a few words conversation, recognised each other. We then conducted our brother to our humble residence, where he found his and our dear mother—and before the close of that day we had the most joyful greeting with our newly arrived self-emancipated brethren. Our mother, who had long been robbed of her children, was here unexpectedly, and joyfully permitted to meet them under the protection of Britain's Flag.

☞ Rev. HENRY WARD BEECHER announces that he will reply, and conclusively, to the charges preferred against him in a late number of the *New York Observer*. It will be, we fancy, a reply worth reading.

ESCAPE OF A LARGE NUMBER OF SLAVES.—Thirty-one slaves, from the neighbourhood of Augusta and Dover, escaped to Ohio last night. They were traced to Ripley on the river, and were pursued by their owners and others from this side. The clothes taken by the slaves were concealed in a yard, and the pursuers were refused a warrant to search the house in which it was supposed most of the slaves were hid. Five, who had continued on, were pursued by their masters, and three captured. They are expected to be brought over to-night. The negroes of Ripley assisted in numbers, armed with guns, surrounded the hotel where the Kentuckians stopped. Fears are entertained of a serious disturbance, as the Kentuckians remain there on the watch, and are determined to recover the slaves. Much indignation is felt here, because the authorities of Ripley refused to assist the masters, by granting warrants.—*Tel. Dispatch from Maysville, Ky.*

Miscellaneous News.

ADDRESS

OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEW YORK STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY TO THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS: The Temperance enterprise in our State has reached an interesting crisis. Those who have most intently watched its progress thus far, and most earnestly considered the obstacles in the way of its perfect triumph, have become impressed with the conviction that it can attain no considerable advance from its present position, except through a radical change in the laws relating to the traffic in intoxicating drinks. Hitherto, these laws have been predicated upon the principle of *regulation*. But the leviathan is not thus to be drawn out with a hook, nor his tongue with a cord which thou lettest down. The traffic is incurably *irregular*. Under this false principle of regulation, drunkenness has become the overshadowing crime of the land, the parent of other crimes manifold, and of crimes that defy all portraiture. All who love God, or their fellow-men, or their country, should repudiate it, as alike false and murderous. In behalf of an oppressed and stricken people, let us demand a change of policy—the substitution of a better principle. Let our legislation no longer aim at the *regulation*, but the utter *prohibition* of a mischievous and murderous traffic.

We need, for this State, a prohibitory law, modelled upon that of Maine. To this end are the energies of our Society directed. To contribute, at least in a small degree, to this result, is the object of the present Address.

But this result is not to be attained without labour, self-denial, and self-sacrifice. Organization, unity of action, and the subordination of all inferior issues to our great object, are indispensable to success. We believe that we utter but the sentiments of a large majority of the citizens of this State, when we say that morality, sound policy, the interests and safety of the people, all demand the outlawry of the liquor traffic. But without concert of action, the public sentiment can find no embodiment in law. The friends of prohibitory legislation must themselves secure the good that they desire. The representatives of the Liquor Interest will not frame laws for the destruction of that interest. Satan does not thus cast out Satan.

Our first duty is, therefore, to secure a Maine Law Legislature. We have no wish to interfere with the arrangements of existing parties, or to institute a new one; but as morality must always take the precedence of mere policy, no ordinary political or financial issue should be permitted to over-ride the question of Temperance. Let the Whig be a Whig still—let the Democrat be a Democrat still, in their party preferences and political action; but let neither forget the superior claims of Temperance. Nay, let them give their respective parties to understand, clearly and distinctly, that they will *not* do so—that however desirous they may be to sustain party nominations, they can never consent to do it at the expense of a great moral principle. Such a position, calmly taken and firmly maintained, will secure the nomination, by all parties, of Temperance men, and of consequence, the election of a Legislature ready to concede the protection which we demand.

It is objected that Temperance should not be brought into politics. We answer: the opponents of Temperance have not left that an open question. The Liquor Interest constitutes to-day a leading and acknowledged element of political power. It decides who shall be our law-makers, and what shall be the character of our legislation. It throws around a criminal traffic the highest sanction known to civil government, and covers with the protecting shield of law, the conscience of the trafficker, that might otherwise be transfixed by the arrows of truth. The real issue, therefore, is whether Intemperance, which has entrenched itself in our laws and politics, shall be dislodged by an antagouist interest, or remain undisturbed. To give up our politics to the opponents of Temperance, is to give up all. Through politics, Legislatures are created, laws enacted, institutions founded, and society, through all its ramifications, impressed for good or for evil. Politics, controlled by the Liquor Interest, will give us anti-temperance legislators, license-laws, drinking-houses of every name and grade, and render still more widely prevalent those customs of society which constitute the nursery of drunkenness, with its inseparable degradation and crime. Surely, they do not know what they ask, who implore us to keep Temperance out of politics.

Consistency is an element of power. Who can demand respect for his opinion when he evidently feels none for it himself? when he repudiates in action what he affirms in words? To denounce the traffic in intoxicating drinks, as immoral, and yet engage in, or license it, is not more inconsistent than to petition for its prohibition, and yet elect men to the Legislature who will again and again contemptuously reject our prayer. Such policy is suicidal, for it leaves us neither moral nor political power for the accomplishment of good.

We should not forget that law, when founded upon, and in harmony with, moral principle, is one of the most comprehensive and effective of the moral forces. It *educates* the people, not only into right deeds, but also into right thoughts, right convictions, and right principles. It must be obvious to every one who has measured the strength of our common enemy, that we need, if we would compass his overthrow, the most powerful weapons that we can wield against him. We may be told that *Truth* is that weapon. Conceded—but it is truth, not uttered from the pulpit and the lecture-room merely—not impressed upon our philosophies and our theories only, but also and more especially upon our *practices*—truth moulding our politics, speaking through our legislators, and imparting vitality to our laws.

The inseparable connection between the liquor traffic and intemperance, and between intemperance and crime, justifies, if it does not compel, the assertion, that to sanction the traffic by legislation, is, in effect, to sanction crime. We are not speaking at random, or indulging in declamation, as the following statistics, referring to the City of New York, and given upon the authority of Mr. Matsell, the Chief of the Police, will show:

"During a period of six and a half years past, there have been (in the City of New York) 140,783 arrests for offences resulting almost entirely from intemperance. During the six months ending with the 31st of December, 1851, 18,458 arrests were made, nearly all of which were for intoxication, or offences resulting therefrom, such as assault and battery, disorderly conduct, fighting in the street, vagrancy, &c. During the year 1851, there were *thirty-six* persons arrested for *murder* in that city alone—and in nearly every instance the crime was directly traceable to intemperance."

Terrible as this catalogue of crime is, it is only a local exhibition of effects which, proceeding from the same cause, pervade the State; and the inevitable ministry of the liquor-shops is making large additions to it every week, and almost every day. How, then, can we approve ourselves honest and true men, lovers of our fellows and of our country, if we refuse to wield our elective franchise for the abatement of this great evil? for the correction of that vicious legislation which generates and perpetuates the very vice which threatens to destroy every interest which Government is bound to protect?

While, therefore, consistency, morality and sound policy, all demand that we should remember the Temperance Cause at the ballot-box, we desire to avoid if possible, identifying it with any political party, new or old. We do not, we repeat, ask Whigs to be any the less Whigs, or Democrats any the less Democrats, than now; but we *do* urge both Whigs and Democrats to be consistent Temperance men, always and everywhere, in the primary meeting, the district caucus, the mass convention, at the ballot-box, and in the Legislative Hall. Such a course, undeviatingly pursued by Temperance men, could neither be overlooked nor disregarded by politicians. Hitherto, as a general fact, parties have been subjected to the pressure of anti-temperance influence only; the necessity of conciliating the temperance interest has not been felt. The course recommended would change all this. Let it be understood that Temperance men, *as such*, have votes, and nominations would be made with special reference to that fact. The ultimate effect would be the purification of our politics and the improvement of our legislation. The attainment of so great a good may surely justify the inconsiderable sacrifice it may cost; especially when we remember how vital and how constant must be the sacrifice on the side of its non-attainment.

Another annual election is close at hand, when the people are to decide, at the ballot-box, whether all the great interests of society shall still be imperilled by a traffic that wars against them all, and tramples upon the plainest principles of morality. This issue must be met and decided. To vote for men who will continue to such a traffic the protection of the law, is to vote for the continuance of the traffic itself, with all the wretchedness, irreligion, blasphemy, crime, pollution, and death, which it inevitably involves. Fellow-labourers, we entreat you to consider this matter well; and inasmuch as the interests of Temperance—including, as they do, the moral, and, in no small degree, the physical well-being of society—are paramount to all ordinary political issues—let no desire for a partisan triumph, no hope of political preferment, and no expectation of pecuniary emolument, induce you to give your suffrages for the election of any man to office (the duties of which concern the enactment or administration of license laws) in whose temperance principles you have not entire confidence, and who will not give you every reasonable assurance that his personal and official influence are sacredly pledged to the enactment and enforcement of laws entirely prohibitory of the traffic in intoxicating drinks as a beverage.

Let the friends of Temperance, in their respective parties, secure the nomination of such men. No honourable means should be left untried that may be necessary to this result. If you fail, and can yet obtain the election of a Temperance Legislator, by the sacrifice of your political preferences, hesitate not for a moment to make it. It is the surrender of the less good to secure the greater—the sacrifice of feeling to principle. If neither party shall nominate Temperance men, let that contingency also be provided for. No specific suggestions are needed from us, as to the manner in which this should be done. Local circumstances, of which we have no knowledge, will decide questions of mere *policy*; all that we have a right to insist upon is, that Temperance men, under *all* circumstances, be true to *principle*, and give no ballot that shall practically endorse the destructive immorality of the traffic in liquor.

We would recommend frequent meetings of the friends of Temperance—neighbourhood meetings for consultation and discussion—the circulation of Tracts and other publications—and a thorough organization, in such form as shall secure effective co-operation in every movement necessary for the advancement of the Cause. Let there be no jealousies or feuds among the friends of Temperance—no collisions between the different organizations; for however diverse they are in name, they are essentially one in spirit and in purpose. He is an enemy to our Cause, who would foment dissensions among us.

We also recommend the appointment of a Central Committee in every County in the State, with a Corresponding Secretary, whose duty it shall be, to put himself in communication with the Corresponding Secretary of the State Society—making and receiving such suggestions as may be advantageous to the Cause, and extending the knowledge of such incidents as may illustrate its progress.

In conclusion, we add only our deep conviction that the measures we recommend are indispensable to the final triumph of the Cause which we have been labouring so many years to advance. The time is auspicious; events are co-operative; the example and successes of sister States inspiring. A united movement upon Legislation, through the ballot-box, and we shall be able to announce from the Capitol in the authoritative language of LAW, that the sale, if not the use, of intoxicating liquors, as a beverage, has come to an end in the State of New York.

H. MANDEVILLE, *Ch'n. Ex. Com.*
W. H. BURLEIGH, *Cor. Sec'y*

THE Provincial Government has closed a contract with William Jackson, M. P., for himself and wealthy associates in England, to build a railway across New Brunswick, from Nova Scotia to the United States.

AN association has been formed for the purpose of establishing an institution under the name of the People's College, in which labour and instruction are to be combined. They hold a meeting at Seneca Falls on the 14th of next month.

SUCCESSFUL SUIT AGAINST A CITY.—The Boston *Courier* says: In the case of Miss Ann M. Clark, who sued the City for damages to the amount of $20,000, for injuries sustained in consequence of a fall into a cellar way, in Hawkins-street, on the evening of the 19th of last September, the Jury, on Saturday, returned a verdict allowing her $3,500. Miss Clark has been confined at the Hospital for nearly a year.

AT the camp meeting at Bethel last week, says the Portland *Advertiser*, it was noticed that some "New Testaments" which were hawked about near the camp ground, sold rapidly, especially to the unconverted; and it turned out that they were "earthen vessels" in the form of books, filled with liquor. Two persons who were engaged in the business were arrested, and fined $10 and costs each.

COLOURED METHODISTS.—An exchange says that more than half the Methodists of the South Carolina Conference of the M. E. Church South, are coloured, and nearly half of the members of the *Georgia* Conference are coloured.

"IF I ever, as Gen. Scott, at the head of the armies of the United States, as plain Mr. Scott, deprived of my commission, or as President Scott, if it should please the people to elevate me to that high position, if I ever do anything calculated to impair the efficiency of the fugitive slave, law, or having a tendency to its repeal, then write infamous before my name, and kick me into the gutter."—*Gen. Scott to Mr. Upton of Louisiana.*

THE number of adults in the State of Georgia who cannot read or write, is 41,000—and the number of children whose parents are unable to send them to school is upwards of 38,000. The Norfolk *Argus* says, that according to the official returns, the number of adults in Virginia who cannot read or write, is 80,000—twenty thousand more than in 1840; and the number of children whose parents have not the means to educate them, 85,000. And yet Virginia refuses to take her share of the Distribution Fund—even to educate her children.

A ROLAND FOR HIS OLIVER.—Gen. Houston, in his speech the other night, said that a man named Foss was once in the Virginia Penitentiary, and upon the strength of that single fact, he pretended to believe the Rev. Mr. Foss, of New Hampshire, who reported Gen. Pierce's New Boston speech, to be a penitentiary convict, in defiance of the strong and high testimonials of Mr. F's good moral character. A highly respectable Baptist preacher of this city, who has known Mr. Foss, of New Hampshire, for more than twenty years, assures us, that as a man and a clergyman, Mr. F. has ever been above reproach, distinguished for his exemplary life and piety. He authorizes us to say, that while residing a few years ago at Montpelier, Vt., a fellow named Houston, who came there and pretended to teach painting to young ladies, ran away without paying his tavern bill, and, on being overtaken by the Sheriff, pulled off his coat and jacket, and begged the Sheriff to cowhide him to the amount of his bill, and let him off. We indulge in no speculations as to what "Honston" this was.—*Louisville Journal.*

DECISION IN AN IMPORTANT LIQUOR CASE AT PROVIDENCE R. I., SEPT. 28.—The case of W. H. Greene was decided yesterday in the Court of Magistrates, and the liquor to the amount of some $3,000, was declared forfeited, and ordered to be destroyed by the City Marshal, who proceeded to execute the decision of the court but was stayed by a writ of replevin, issued by the Circuit Court of the United States for this District, at the instance of Mr. Greene, by the U. S. Marshal. This case has been some time before the court, and involved a greater amount of the contraband article than has been heretofore seized under the Maine Liquor law in New England. The liquor was said to belong to a Mr. Holbrook, and as the property of Mr. Holbrook was condemned; but it is now claimed by Mr. Wm. H. Greene, who is at present a resident of New York city.

Considerable excitement was observable among the citizens yesterday; but the transfer of the Liquor law was made without any manifestations to create a disturbance. All parties seemed pleased with the idea of having the liquor question come before the United States Court, and as this is the first case so carried up, the result will be looked for with much interest by States where the suppressive law is in operation, or where efforts are making to have it introduced.

NUCLEUS OF A LIBRARY.—At a supper given to JOHN P. HALE, at Cleveland, Ohio, he related as a fact for the encouragement of young men, that, a few days before, he was in Boston, and was introduced into a large room so filled with books that there was not room enough vacant for a "New England Primer." A lady asked him if he would like to see the "nucleus" of the library. He replied yes. She showed him a Latin dictionary purchased by the owner when a boy, with money obtained by the sale of blue berries. The owner was the son of a farmer, and commenced his library in that way. He is now familiar with the language of the past and the present, a man of thought, and that man is THEODORE PARKER.

AT a meeting of the Governor and Council of Mass. on Friday, the Committee on Pardons made a report in favour of commuting the punishment of Thomas Davis, convicted for the murder of his sister, Mrs. Van Wagner, from death to imprisonment for life, at hard labour in the State Prison. The Council thereupon unanimously adopted the report, and Davis will therefore go to the State Prison.

TELEGRAPH BETWEEN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.—The London correspondent of *The National Intelligencer* gives the following description of the new project for a submarine telegraph between Great Britain and America. The writer considers this new plan by far the most feasible yet proposed:

We stated, a few weeks ago, that a project had been formed for constructing a submarine telegraph between Great Britain and the United States, by a route not before thought of, which would very materially shorten the line of water transit render the transmission of intelligence much less liable to interruption, and most materially diminish the cost of construction and repairs. We have now the map of the proposed submarine lines before us. They commence at the most northwardly point of Scotland, run thence to the Orkney Islands, and thence by short water lines, to the Shetland and the Ferroe Islands. From the latter, a water line of 200 to 300 miles conducts the telegraph to Iceland; from the western coast of Iceland, another submarine line conveys it to Kioge Bay, on the eastern coast of Greenland; it then crosses Greenland to Juliana's Hope on the western coast of that continent, in latitude 60 deg. 42 min.; and is conducted thence by a water line of about 500 miles, across Davis' Straits to Byron's Bay, on the coast of Labrador. From this point the line is to be extended to Quebec.

The entire length of the line is approximately estimated at 2,500 miles, and the submarine portions of it at from 1,400 to 1,600 miles. The peculiar advantage of the line being divided into several submarine portions is, that if a fracture should at any time occur, the defective part could be very readily discovered and repaired promptly at a comparatively trifling expense. From the Shetland Islands, it is proposed to carry a branch to Bergen, in Norway, connecting it there with a line to Christiana, Stockholm, Gottenburg, and Copenhagen; from Stockholm a line may easily cross the Gulf of Bothnia to St. Petersburg. The whole expense of this great international work is estimated considerably below £500,000, but to cover contingencies, it is proposed to raise that sum by 25,000 shares of £20 each. We confess that we consider this plan as by far the most feasible one which has been yet produced for connecting Europe and America by the electric telegraph.

AFTER THEM.—Gen. Sam Houston, in a speech delivered not long since, charged that the Rev. A. T. Foss, a Baptist clergyman of New Hampshire, in good and regular church standing, who reported Gen. Pierce's New Boston speech was a thief, and had been in the State Prison! The reverend gentleman does not succomb to, or relish this charge. At least, we learn that he started last week for the South, with the intention of overtaking Houston, and bringing him to legal account for the libel. He intends, also, it is stated, to call upon certain editors who have given publicity in the charge. Mr. Foss is said to be a man of such unflagging perseverence, that nothing short of obtaining complete satisfaction, can shake him from any purpose like that of following up a thing of the kind. As he has the sympathy and co-operation of the Baptist denomination in New Hampshire—and is likely to receive those of the same sect in the South—it is quite probable that we may yet hear something of one or more of his interviews with his defamers at the South.

A BLACK girl, a slave, went on a visit from Memphis to the interior of Ohio and didn't return. Her master published an advertisement in the Cincinnati *Gazette*, offering a hundred dollars for her apprehension. The proprietors of the *Gazette* said on the following day, that, if they had seen the advertisement when it was sent to them, they would not have published it, and that, according to their understanding of the law, the girl, having been permitted to visit a free State, was just as free as her master. The editors of the *Frankfort Yeoman* call our attention to this matter and express the hope that we shall no longer take them to task for saying "Gen. Scott's chief supporters loathe, hate, and spit upon the Whig platform."

We certainly shall take the editors of the *Yeoman* to task for saying this, whenever they do say it. There is nothing in the remarks of the Cincinnati *Gazette* inconsistent with either the Whig platform or the Democratic platform. Neither of those platforms requires that an editor should publish any advertisement that he doesn't wish to publish, and neither of those platforms says that a slave who makes a visit to a free State with the master's consent doesn't become thereby as free as he is.—*Louisville Journal.*

AWAY TO CANADA.—The Underground Railroad from the neighbouring slave States to the Canadian Line was never doing a better business than it is this season, in defiance of the fugitive bill. The slaves and Abolitionists have just been holding a great Convention, in which they have decided that there is a "higher law" than that of slave catching—that Canada is a free country, and that the Underground Railroad cars shall carry refugees to it, both night and day, free of cost to them, until Daniel Webster or Lewis Cass is elected President of the United States, or chattel Slavery is abolished. In a single day last week, there were not less than sixty-five coloured emigrants landed at this place from the South, among whom there was a bride and groom from Maysville, Ky. The husband learned, about six hours before he started for Canada, that he was sold to a slave-trader, who was going to take him from his family the next morning in a chain-gang for New Orleans; but the husband and wife resolved that they would never again close their eyes for sleep until they had made a vigorous effort to escape the approaching coffle gang, for freedom. For this dangerous undertaking they had only five cents in money, and no craft in which they could safely venture across the river Ohio. After walking up and down the river bank, they found an old skiff with the bottom partly out of it, which was thrown away. They launched it into the water, and saw that it would be very likely to sink before they could paddle it across, and yet they ventured to run the risk for the sake of freedom; and when they landed on the other shore, the boat was nearly filled with water. They had not proceeded far before they found a depot of the above railroad, which soon wafted them to this place; and, the best of all, they had not proceeded far before the wife had the unspeakable joy of meeting her own brother in the streets of Windsor, whom she had not seen for several years, who had also made his way to Canada. This was truly a happy greeting.—*Voice of the Fugitive.*

KIDNAPPERS IN ASHTABULA COUNTY.—It has often been said both in public and private that no slaveholder would ever attempt the rendition of a slave from Giddings' district. And that if it were attempted it could never be accomplished, for there were hundreds of men, to say nothing of women, who would rather die, than see one of their number dragged from their midst to the hell of Slavery. You may imagine then the excitement that a number of our citizens were thrown into the other day upon a rumour becoming prevalent that two veritable slave-catchers were in this and the adjacent towns making enquiry as to the whereabouts of a young coloured man, who has resided in this part of the country for several years past. The two men suspected were said to have come from the South, and having past through this town arrived at Cherry Valley, where having lost their way, made enquiry for one George Garlick, of Dorset. This is the name of the coloured man. After considerable difficulty they found the road to their place of destination. But such was the excitement produced that couriers were sent in different directions, warning the people of the presence of these man thieves. It was near night when word reached us and a restless one it was, both to men and women. Before ten o'clock that night no less than four messengers arrived from different directions to put the friends where the coloured man was supposed to be, on their guard. One of whom was a Baptist Deacon. It happened too, that the slaveholders were staying at the very house, altogether unsuspected of having any such demon purpose in their hearts.

Next morning they left without making any attempt to kidnap or arrest, and I can assure you it was no small relief, when we heard that the men who had thus disturbed the peace of our community had gone to the Anti-Slavery Convention at Linesville, and were none other than our old staunch friends BENJAMIN BOWN and SAMUEL MYERS, the latter an old quaker preacher, and both as rabid Abolitionists as the Western Anti-Slavery Society can produce.

The mistake originated in their enquiry for George instead of Anson Garlick. It was well they didn't get a coat of tar and feathers for their blunder.—*Cor. of Ohio Bugle.*

NEW YORK STATE TEMPERANCE ALLIANCE.—A meeting of the New York State Temperance Alliance is to be held at the city of Rochester, on the 19th instant, commencing at 10 A. M., when the course to be pursued by the Alliance respecting the approaching election, will be determined upon. A General Convention of the friends of Temperance will be held at the same place on the following day, to which all pledged Temperance men, being legal voters, are invited.

Public meetings will be held on the evenings of both days, and addresses delivered by eminent speakers from different parts of the State.

Receipts for the Standard.

From Sept. 1st to Oct. 1st, 1852.

660	J. Berry, Spencer, Mass.	1 00
704	I. P. Hambleton, Calcutta, O.	5 00
624	Dr. J. W. Scott, Parkman "	9 00
676	John Woodcock, Leicester, Mass.	2 00
682	Richard Plumer, Newburyport, Mass.	2 00
632	L. Benedict, Lowell, Wis.	2 00
650	D. L. Galbreath, New Garden, O.	5 00
676	Joseph Carpenter, New Rochelle, N. Y.	2 00
667	Geo. J. Peterson, Doxbury, Mass.	1 00
652	James Brown, N. Y. City, N. Y.	0 50
640	P. G. Wood, Upton, Mass.	4 20
656	H. Jennis, Peru, Ind.	1 50
676	N. Barney, Nantucket, Mass.	2 00
676	B. Barney, Weedsport, N. Y.	2 00
642	Mrs. Nancy Babcock, Boston, Mass.	2 40
690	Miss Shackleton, Cuyahoga Falls, O.	2 00
691	R. Peabody, Barton Landing, V

Miscellaneous Department.

A SEARCH FOR ROBIN HOOD.

The adventures of an amateur in search of a picture, of a foundling in search of his father, and even of a dog in search of his master, have been severally recorded by skilful pens for the amusement of the public. But, however entertaining or romantic these narratives may be considered, they can hardly surpass in interest the curious history which has just been disclosed of the adventures of an antiquary in search of a ballad-hero. We owe our knowlege of the facts to one of a series of *Critical and Historical Tracts*, by the Rev. Joseph Hunter, now in course of publication. Mr. Hunter is an assistant-keeper of the public records, and is well known, by his other publications, as one of the most laborious and most judicious elucidators of mysterious passages in our national history. But the evidences of industry, of minute knowledge, and of logical acuteness, contained in his little treatise concerning 'the ballad-hero, Robin Hood,' are really surprising. The story of an obscure outlaw, who chased deer and took purses in a northern forest five hundred years ago, has been investigated with the painstaking sagacity of a Niebuhr; and a strong light has been unexpectedly thrown on the state of public sentiment and manners existing at that period. Mr. Hunter, it is proper to say, dwells in his treatise chiefly upon results, and says little, and that very modestly, of the labours by which they were obtained. He even seems to fear that his subject may be considered trivial, and that he may possibly receive 'the censure of being one who busies himself with with the mere playthings of antiquity.' Dr. Percy, when he compiled his invaluable Reliques, had similar apprehensions, which were then not altogether groundless; but it may reasonably be hoped, that the race of pedants, who wondered how a man of learning could be interested in a bundle of old ballads, is now extinct.

Departing a little from the method and order observed by Mr. Hunter in his tract, we will endeavour not only to state in a condensed form the remarkable conclusions at which he has arrived, but also to follow, as accurately as his references will enable us to do so, the ingenious processes of investigation which led to these results. The object of the inquiry was to determine, in the first place, whether such a person as Robin Hood ever existed; and, in the second place, to ascertain who and what he was, and to what extent the ballads of which he was the hero were based upon actual occurrence. What a vast amount of uncertainty there was to clear up, may be inferred from the wide differences of opinion among writers of the highest credit who preceded Mr. Hunter in this inquiry. The celebrated historian of the Norman Conquest, M. Thierry, supposes Robin Hood to have been the chief of a small body of Saxons, who, in their forest strongholds, held out for a time against the domination of the Norman conquerors. On this point, as confessedly on others, the French historian seems to have derived his opinions from the suggestive scenes in Scott's splendid romance of *Ivanhoe*. Another writer conjectures, that the outlaws of whom Robin was the leader may have been some of the adherents of Simon de Montfort, whose partizans were pursued to extremity after the fatal battle of Evesham, in the year 1264. Others, still, have denied altogether the existence, at any period, of such a person as Robin Hood. They make him either a mere hero of romance—the 'creation of some poetical mind;' or else, led by a similarity of names, they discover in him merely one of the embodiments of popular superstitions—a sylvan sprite, a Robin Goodfellow, or a Hudkin. Only two years ago, a historical writer of no small acumen, Mr. Thomas Wright, published his opinion, that Robin Hood, in his original character, was simply 'one amongst the personages of the early mythology of the Teutonic people.'

But Mr. Hunter could not concur in these views, or be satisfied with the mode of reasoning by which they were maintained. In his opinion, Robin Hood was neither a Saxon malcontent nor the hero of a poet's romance; nor yet was he 'a goblin or a myth.' He was, in all probability, exactly such a person as the popular songs described him—an English yeoman, an outlaw living in the woods, and noted for his skill in archery. Previous researches had proved that many of our old ballads are merely rhyming records of historical events. Mr. Hunter had already rescued one ballad-hero, Adam Bell, from the 'danger of being reduced to an abstraction or a myth,' and it now remained for him to undertake the same good office for a more renowned freebooter.

The first thing to be done was, of course, to examine carefully the ballads themselves, and to ascertain the amount and value of the evidence they afforded, as to the epoch and the real story of their hero. It appeared, then, that 'three single ballads are found in manuscript, which cannot be later than the fourteenth century.' There is also a poem of considerable length, entitled *The Lytel Geste of Robyn Hood*, which was printed by Winkyn de Worde, in or about the year 1495. It is 'a kind of life' of the outlaw, and is composed of several ballads, strung together by means of a few intermediate stanzas, which give continuity to the story. The language of these ballads is that of the preceding century—being, in fact, the same as that of the ballads in manuscript. Thus the date of the songs themselves is carried back as far as the fourteenth century. It is, moreover, in the middle of this century that the first allusion to Robin Hood occurs in any work of undoubted authority. In Longland's poem, entitled *The Vision of Pierce Ploughman*, the date of which is between 1355 and 1365, mention is made of 'rymes of Robyn Hood and Randolph Earl of Chester,' the outlaw and the earl being apparently both regarded as historical personages, about whom songs had been written. It may be observed, that if the Robin Hood ballads were much older than this date, it must be considered surprising that no earlier allusion to them should be found, since in the subsequent century they were referred to by many writers.

According to the story contained in the Lytel Geste, Robin Hood was at the head of a band of outlaws, who made their head-quarters in Bernysdale, or Barnesdale—once 'a woody and famous forest,' on the southern confines of Yorkshire, in the neighbourhood of Doncaster, Wakefield, and Pontefract; and who infested the woodlands and the highways from thence as far as Sherwood and Nottingham, near which ancient town some of their boldest exploits were performed. They slew the king's deer, and plundered rich travellers, but spared the humble, relieved the distressed, and were courteous to all who did not offend them.

> Robyn was a proude outlaw
> Whyles he walked on ground;
> So curtyse an outlaw as he was one,
> Was never none yfound.

All the ballads agree in ascribing to the outlaw chief a manly bearing and a generous disposition, such as might be expected to distinguish a respectable yeoman of a class somewhat above the ordinary, whom the fortune of war had driven from his home to a lawless life in the forest. That this was Robin Hood's condition, may be inferred from the general language of the ballads; but the important question is, whether any other testimony can be found to confirm this conjecture, and to give us any definite and authentic information about the fact. This is the question which Mr. Hunter has undertaken to answer. The clue which first catches his experienced eye is *the name of an English king*. One of the most remarkable adventures which the ballads record of Robin Hood is his meeting with the king, who induced him, for a time, to take service in his household. The king, according to this authority, was exasperated with Robin and his men chiefly on account of the destruction which they had made of his deer. Finding that it was impossible to capture the outlaw by force, the king consented to practise a stratagem, suggested by a forester who was well acquainted with the outlaw's habits. He disguised himself as an abbot, and with five knights habited as monks, and a man leading sumpter-horses, rode into the greenwood. A wealthy abbot's baggage, and his ransom, would be just the bait most tempting to Robin and his men. The king, as he had expected, was seized by them, and led away to their lodge in the forest. The outlaws, however, behave courteously as usual; and when the abbot announces that he comes from the king at Nottingham, and brings a letter from his majesty, inviting Robin to come to that town, the latter receives the information joyously, and declares that 'he loves no man in all the world so well as he does his king.' Presently the monarch discovers himself, and the outlaw chief and his men kneel, and profess their loyalty—Robin at the same time asking for mercy for him and his. The king grants it on condition that Robin will leave the greenwood, and will come to court and enter his service. We quote the following after Mr. Hunter, merely modernising the orthography:

> 'Yes, fore God!' then said our king,
> 'Thy petition I grant thee,
> With that thou leave the greenwood,
> And all thy company;
>
> 'And come home, sir, to my court,
> And there dwell with me.'
>
> 'I make mine avow to God,' said Robin,
> 'And right so shall it be:
>
> 'I will come to your court
> Your service for to see.'

Accordingly, Robin left the greenwood and his company, entered the king's household, went with him to the court at London, and remained in his service for a year and three months. Having by that time become weary of this uncongenial mode of life, he obtained permission from the king to pay a visit to his old residence at Barnesdale. Here he resumes once more his former way of life 'under the greenwood-tree,' and becomes again chief of the outlaws of Barnesdale and Sherwood.

Now if, among the adventures ascribed to Robin by the old ballads, there is one far more improbable than all the rest, and one which an ordinary commentator would set down at once as a pure fiction of the poet, it is certainly that which has just been related. Mr. Hunter, however, is not an ordinary commentator. If the story is a strange one, he doubtless reflected, 'truth is stranger than fiction;' and if it is intrinsically and evidently improbable, that is the very reason why a poet would not have invented it. Mr. Hunter, therefore, did what no other inquirer had before thought of doing—he examined the historical and documentary evidence which might throw light upon the subject. The ballad, fortunately, gives the name of the king who was concerned in this singular adventure. He is repeatedly spoken of as 'Edward, our comely king'—a phrase, by the way, which clearly implies that the ballad was composed while the monarch was still living. This circumstance is not noticed by Mr. Hunter, but it is one of some importance, inasmuch as a poet would hardly have ventured to introduce the name of the reigning monarch into a purely fictitious narrative. But there are three Edwards—the first, second and third of the name, among whom it is necessary to distinguish the one to whom the poet referred. Now, according to the ballad, this 'comely king,' before he fell in with Robin, had journeyed through the county of Lancaster:

> All the pass of Lancashire,
> He went both far and near,
> Till he came to Plumpton Park,
> He failed [missed] many of his deer.

The question then arises, which of the three Edwards did travel in that county? To this question, Mr. Hunter's researches fortunately enable him to return a decisive answer. King Edward I. never was in Lancashire after he became king. King Edward III. was not in Lancashire in the early years of his reign, and probably never at all. But King Edward II. did make a 'progress' in Lancashire, and only one. The time was in the autumn of 1323, the seventeenth year of his reign, and the fortieth of his age. By the dates of the royal writs, and by other documents, Mr. Hunter is enabled to trace the king's route and his various removes on this occasion with great minuteness. He follows him, for example, from York to Holderness; thence to Pickering, to Wherlton Castle, to Richmond and Jervaulx Abbey, and to Haywra Park, in the forest of Knaresborough. In this forest is situated Plumpton Park, which is mentioned in the ballad as having been visited by the king, who here became aware of Robin's depredations. King Edward proceeded thence by way of Skipton, and several other towns, to Liverpool, and, continuing his progress, arrived on the 9th of November at Nottingham, where he remained till the 23d of that month; and it was from Nottingham, it will be remembered, that the king set out in disguise to look for Robin Hood.

But if the 'proud outlaw' on this occasion actually took service in the king's household, his name would be likely to appear among those of the royal attendants, if any list of these is preserved. This consideration occurred to Mr. Hunter. The result of his search must be told in his own words. 'It will scarcely be believed,' he observes, 'but it is, nevertheless, the plain and simple truth, that in documents preserved in the Exchequer, containing accounts of expenses in the king's household, we find the name of "Robyn Hode," not once, but several times occurring, receiving, with about eight-and-twenty others, the pay of 3d. a day, as one of the "*valets, porteurs de la chambre*" of the king. Whether this was some other person who chanced to bear the same name, or that the ballad-maker has in this related what was mere matter of fact, it will become no one to affirm in a tone of authority. I, for my part, believe it is the same person.' Mr. Hunter then quotes the words of the original record, which is in Norman-French. It recites the names the twenty-four '*portours*'—as the word is here spelled—who received pay from the 24th of March to the 21st of April, 1324; and among those are the names of 'Robyn Hod' and 'Simon Hod.' These names do not occur in any previous document. The date of the record, it will be observed, is in the spring of the year following that in which the king made his progress through Lancashire, and stayed for some time at Nottingham on his return southward.

The office of valet, or *porteur de la chambre*, in those days, was probably similar to that of the present groom of the chamber, and, if so, was a highly respectable and confidential post. In the ballad, Robin Hood is represented, while at court, as spending his money freely with knights and squires. His profusion, indeed, soon exhausted his purse, which the daily pay of 3d., however munificent it may have been at that period, could not replenish. Robin became, observes Mr. Hunter, moody and melancholy:

> 'Alas!' then said good Robin,
> 'Alas, and well-a-day!
> If I dwell longer with the king,
> Sorrow will me slay.'

At last, he petitions the king for permission to pay a visit to his chapel at Barnesdale; declaring, that for seven nights he has not been able to sleep, nor for seven days to eat or drink, so sore is his longing to see Barnesdale again. The king consents, but only for a se'nnight; 'in which,' says Mr. Hunter, 'I suspect a corruption, for there was no Great Northern in those days.' Probably the leave of absence was for seven weeks instead of days.

Now, it is remarkable, that in the Exchequer paylists, the new porteurs name continues to appear (once under the form of Robert Hood) until the 22d of November, 1324. Under this date appears an entry, which Mr. Hunter has given in the original Norman-French, but which we prefer to translate: 'Robyn Hod, heretofore one of the porteurs, because he could work no longer, received as a gift, by command, 5s.' After this, we are told, his name does not again appear. The 22d of November, 1324, was just a year from the time when the king was at Nottingham, where he arrived on the 9th of November, 1323. Robin Hood, if he then took service, would have been in the royal household about a twelvemonth. The ballad, however, makes his service last for a year and three months. The discrepancy is not great; and it may, perhaps, be explained by the circumstance, that when Robin left the court, it was at first merely on leave of absence; and he would, consequently, still regard himself as in the king's service until he had finally determined to renounce it, which probably would not be until at least his term of leave had expired. The remarkable expression in the record, 'because he could no longer work,' seems, as Mr. Hunter remarks, to correspond with Robin's declarations in the ballad, that he could neither eat, drink, nor sleep; and if he remained longer at court, sorrow would kill him. This apparent coincidence, the author adds, 'may be but imagination; but it looks like a reality.' It must be admitted, that if the Robyn Hod, or Robert Hood, of the Exchequer records be not Robin Hood the outlaw, then all these singular agreements of names, of dates, and of circumstances, will make together a far greater marvel than any that is to be found in the ballad-story itself, which some sceptics would require us to disbelieve.

This, however, is only the commencement of Mr. Hunter's researches, which we cannot here follow in the same detail. The ballads relate that Robin Hood, after continuing twenty-two years in the greenwood, died—through some foul play—at the convent of Kirklees, the prioress of which was nearly related to him. On this hint, Mr. Hunter seeks to discover, through this relationship, the original social position and family connections of the outlaw. He finds reason for believing, that the prioress of Kirklees at that period was a certain Elizabeth de Staynton, a member of a family of some note, established near Barnesdale. The Staynton were tenants in chief of both the 'honours' of Tickhill and Pontefract. One of them was prior of Monk Bretton, and two were incumbents of churches in that vicinity. If Robin Hood was nearly related to this family, the connection would raise him somewhat above the rank of an ordinary yeoman; it might, as the author observes, 'give him that kind of generous air in which he is invested, and qualify him for his station among the valets of the crown.'

But if Robin Hood was a person of good condition, his name might perhaps be found in the law-records of the local courts; and, in fact, Mr. Hunter has found, in the court-rolls of the manor of Wakefield, the name of 'Robertus Hood,' as that of the defendant in a suit relative to a small piece of land, in the ninth year of Edward II. He again appears in a subsequent year, when he is described as being of Wakefield; and the name of his wife, Matilda, is mentioned. Here is another curious coincidence. Mr. Hunter says: 'The ballad testimony is—not the Lytel Geste, but other ballads of uncertain antiquity—that the outlaw's wife was named Matilda, which name she changed for Marian when she joined him in the greenwood.

But what cause could have driven a respectable yeoman like Robin Hood, along with so many others, apparently not much below him in rank, to the fastnesses of the forest? It is evident that only a great civil convulsion could have made, in one district, so large a number of outlaws of this peculiar character. Now, the rising of the discontented barons under the Earl of Lancaster, provoked by the king's favouritism and misgovernment, took place in the early part of the year 1322. By the battle of Boroughbridge, fought on the 16th of March in that year, the insurrection was suppressed. It was punished with great severity. The Earl of Lancaster and many of his adherents were beheaded, and their property was confiscated. Some offenders—probably persons who were not conspicuous in the outbreak—escaped with heavy fines; and among these are mentioned two members of the Staynton family, Robin Hood's supposed connections. We may thence infer the part which he himself probably took in the movement. From his skill with the bow, and from the personal esteem in which he was held, it is likely that he would be a leader of the archers in the rebel force, and would consequently be of importance enough to become specially obnoxious to the king's party. Many others—perhaps the whole company which followed him to battle—might be in the same plight. If so, it would account not only for their outlawry, but for the good-will with which they were regarded by the people of their neighbourhood, who were generally favourable to the cause of the Earl of Lancaster, and looked upon him as a martyr. The battle of Boroughbridge, it should be observed, was fought in the year preceding that in which the king made his progress through the north, and rested for a fortnight at Nottingham.

Mr. Hunter, in conclusion, sums up the results of his investigation in which he cautiously styles his 'theory' concerning the career of the famous ballad-hero. He considers that Robin Hood was one of the 'contrariantes,' or malcontents, of the reign of King Edward II., and that he was still living in the early years of King Edward III.; but that his birth must 'be carried back into the reign of King Edward I., and fixed in the decenary period, 1285 to 1295; that he was born in a family of some station and respectability, seated at Wakefield or in villages around; that he, like many others, partook of the popular enthusiasm which supported the Earl of Lancaster, the great baron of those parts, who, having attempted in vain various changes in the government, at length broke out into open rebellion, with many persons, great and small following his standard; that when the earl fell, and there was a dreadful proscription, a few persons who had been in arms not only escaped the hazards of battle, but the arm of the executioner; that he was one of these; and that he protected himself against the authorities of the time, partly by secreting himself in the depths of the woods of Barnesdale or of the forest of Sherwood, and partly by intimidating the public officers by the opinion which was abroad of his unerring bow, and his instant command of assistance from numerous comrades as skilled in archery as himself; that he supported himself by slaying the wild animals which were found in the forests, and by levying a species of blackmail on passengers along the great road which united London with Berwick, occasionally replenishing his coffers by seizing upon treasure as it was being transported on the road; and there was a self-abandonment and a courtesy in the way in which he proceeded, which distinguishes him from the ordinary highwayman; that he laid down the principle, that he would take from none but those who could afford to lose, and that, if he met with poor persons, he would bestow upon them some part of what he had taken from the rich: in short, that in this respect he was the supporter of the rights or supposed reasonable expectations of the middle and lower ranks—a *leveller* of the times; that he continued this course for about twenty months—April 1322 to December 1323—meeting with various adventures, as such a person must needs do, some of which are related in the ballads respecting him; and when in 1323, the king was intent upon freeing his forests from such marauders, he fell into the king's power; that this was at a time when the bitter feeling with which the king and the Spencers had first pursued those who had shewn themselves such formidable adversaries, had passed away, and a more lenient policy had supervened—the king possibly for some secret and dishonourable reason, not only pardoned him all his transgressions, but gave him the place of one of the *valets, porteurs de la chambre*, in the royal household; which appointment he held for about a year, when the love for the unconstrained life he had led and for the charms of the country returned, and he left the court, and betook himself again to the green-wood shade; that he continued this mode of life we know not exactly how long; and that at last he resorted to the prioress of Kirklees, his own relative, for surgical assistance, and in that priory he died and was buried.'

These conclusions must of course be looked upon at present merely as a series of probable suppositions. Mr. Hunter does not pretend to have placed them within the domain of authentic history. But it is by no means unlikely, that future researches will produce evidence of the indubitable truth of some of them. To Mr. Hunter is due the credit of having first pointed out the direction in which this evidence must be sought, and of having, at the same time, indicated by his example the true value of such researches in the light which they cast on the politics and social life of the period to which they refer.—*Chambers's Edinburgh Journal.*

JOE MILLER.

As it is not generally known, perhaps, among our readers, who Joe Miller was, we will enlighten them a little on the subject. Joe was a copyist by profession, and worked for lawyers in the English Inns of Courts, and flourished in the reign of Queen Anne—if a bare subsistence, earned by his horse-like labours, may be termed flourishing, for he had to work never less than sixteen out of the twenty-four hours, just to supply the wants of natnre, and the wherewithal to pay for a lodging in a mean house, where he had to share with three other young men. Joe was a kind-hearted and simple-minded man, who had never been suspected, even by his best friends, of having had a second idea in his head; and from his extreme good nature had become a butt, at which one and all were constantly throwing their shafts of successful ridicule. But, as we have already said, his perceptions of the ridiculous were of too obtuse a nature for him to have imagined for a single moment that he himself was the object of their ridicule. Many were the practical jokes played off upon poor Joe; he was in the habit of taking his daily meal, which invariably consisted of a twopenny loaf, a slice of single Gloster cheese, sometimes garnished with an onion, and a half-pint of porter, at a house in Shire Lane near Temple Bar. This house was, and had been from time immemorial, the resort of the wits of the day in the early part of the last century. These rosters had long made it their practice to beset poor Miller, but such was his imperturbable immobility, that he bore all and every impertinence with perfect good humour. This singular forbearance elicited their admiration; inquiries were set on foot to ascertain who and what he was, and what his employment was. His routine of life had not varied for several years; his person was meagre, his dress, always threadbare, hung loosely upon his attenuated frame; yet Joe was never known to borrow a shilling, but to have often lent one. The result of the inquiries set on foot concerning Joe were every way quite satisfactory; they ascertained that he had, together with his parents, who were from the northern counties, come to London when Joe was about seven years of age. Things had taken an adverse turn then: they came to poverty and sickness, and at last died, leaving poor Joe entirely destitute. But the kind-hearted neighbours looked to the poor boy, and, as far as in their power lay, fed and clothed him, in return for which he was willing at all times to do their errands, and a thousand little services for which he was eminently fitted, being kind as love itself in his nature. In this shittless kind of manner the poor fellow lived until he was near sixteen, slim as a hurdle and tall as a maypole He found that he must do something else for a livelihood, for that his friends began to slack off in their willingness to serve him, now that nature had transformed him into a man. Joe had contrived among his associates to pick up a small knowledge of writing and reading, with a smattering of arithmetic. An old laundress, who had been one of Joe's best friends, got him into a lawyer's office, to try to do some copying; he soon became expert, and for a long time worked early and late, but so mean was the remuneration, he could hardly make salt for his porridge. Having thus assured themselves by the result of their inquiries of Joe's worth, they determined to assist him by raising a small annuity for him, and the means employed were as follows: They formed themselves into a sort of literary club, each member binding himself to contribute, periodically a laughable tale or jest, of which Joe was to be the reputed father. They soon succeeded in producing a good-sized volume; it was entitled "*Rich and Racy Jests*, by Joseph Miller, Esq., of the Inner Temple, London." It run through three editions the first year, and the profits were amply sufficient to enable his patrons to allow him the very comfortable sum of one guinea per week. Joe, on its being presented to him the first week, and told what had been done for him, was as grateful as his nature permitted him to be; but he, on becoming thus independent, made little or no change in his mode of life; he was certainly a trifle more respectable in the way of apparel, and occasionally indulged in a meat dinner, and this was the only apparent innovation on his economical expenditure. He soon saved enough to start a book store, and after a time became a publisher; and, singular to tell, he ultimately was the publisher of the "*Rich and Racy Jests* of Joseph Miller, Esq." Thus did those mad wags in those days indulge in a spirit of mischief, that redounded, in the end, to their honour and personal benefit, as many of them afterwards experienced, and raised a friend in Joe for their own day of need, for the grateful Joe's house and purse (after he became wealthy) was always in the service of those of his early patrons who had performed the part of the good Samaritan to himself. And, as the sequel shows, Joe actually proved himself a wit of the first water, for he secured to himself a fortune, while many of his bright and intelligent friends had been dissipating theirs.—*Eliza Cook's Journal.*

Yama and the Disciple.

FROM THE SANSCRIT.—BY DR. BOWRING.

PART THE FIRST.

To the young inquirer, Yama
Many a precious gift had given,
And he urged him, "Show me Brahma!
Let me know the Lord of Heaven;
Much thy wisdom hath imparted,
Let me tread not as I trod,
Empty-minded, vacant-hearted—
Show me Brahma! teach me God!"

"Ask me sons and grandsons—cattle,
Elephants, or horses—gold—
Life prolonged—success in battle—
Every bliss by time unrolled;
Ask me empire wide extended,
Earth's most beautiful domains;
Nymphs in whom the graces blended
Shall surpass what fancy feigns!

"Of all wonders, ask the rarest;
Of all songs, the sweetest choose!
Of all gems, select the fairest—
Yama nothing shall refuse.
Ask me not, with vain persistence,
That to see which none can see!
Mysteries of God's existence,
Unapproached Infinity!"

"What is empire? what is pleasure?
What is wealth? all vanities!
Time soon speeds his little measure—
Weary man, exhausted, dies;
Death conveys all mortals nearer
To the Godhead whom I seek;
O reveal Him! show him clearer!
Thou who knowest Brahma! speak!

"Solve my doubts—my vision brighten!
Other wishes have I none!
With God's light my soul enlighten—
Let me know the unknown One!"
Still he urged his prayers on Yama,
Pleading, pleading, there he stood:
"O! unveil the hidden Brahma!
Show me His Beautitude!"

PART THE SECOND.

"Duty, pleasure, virtue, beauty,
Captivate the heart of man;
Blessings, the reward of duty;
Degradation, pleasure's ban.
Virtue, with its contemplations,
Leading upwards—upwards more;
Beauty, with its fascinations,
Dragging downwards—lower—lower!

"Thou, in thy serene reflection,
Seekest the sublimer joys;
Answerest pleasure by rejection,
Honourest duty by thy choice!
Ignorance in vain invites thee,
All its idle dreams are past;
And the knowledge which delights thee
Thy reward shall be at last.

"Ever searching, ever gleaning,
Many a truth thy soul shall hold;
Many a deep mysterious meaning
Shall be gradually unrolled;
Not by disputatious wrangles
Wilt thou fathom the concealed;
Calm communion disentangles
What the Godhead hath revealed.

"Many are his revelations,
Many a gently-wafted word
Wandering 'midst the world's temptations,
All unnoticed—all unheard!
He who reverently listens,
He who meditating wakes,
He shall see heaven's light that glistens,
He shall hear heaven's voice that speaks.

"There's a Godhead in attendance,
Unobserved by ear or eye;
There is a Divine Resplendence
On the darkness of the sky;
Highest of all heights o'ershading
In unmoved complacency;
Deepest of all depths pervading
In serene felicity.

"Sitting still, through space He travels,
Calmly resting, fills all time;
And to the pure heart unravels
E'en his attributes sublime.
Who desires Him shall obtain Him,
He who loves Him wins His love,
Till God's truth shall teach and train him
For the highest seats above."

"WOMEM'S RIGHTS" IN ENGLAND.

At the new elections for the British Parliament this Spring, John Lee, L.L. D., was put in nomination for Bucks, in opposition to Dr. Disraeli, who, however, was returned by so triumphant a majority, that no poll was called for, Dr. Lee's friends being satisfied with the decision of the simple show of hands. Dr. Lee's nomination speech did not appear in the *Times*, but we have received a copy of it printed from the "short-hand reporter's notes" for distribution as a hand-bill. We quote the following passage, as worthy of the convention which recently assembled at Syracuse:

"Dr. Lee proceeded to say, that his honourable opponent, Mr. Disraeli, had, at Marylebone, advocated the ballot (loud cries of hear, hear,) and household suffrage. Might he be permitted to express a hope that the gentleman still advocated these admirable principles (laughter)? Perhaps, indeed, more experience and generosity had by this time taught Mr. Disraeli to go a step further, so as to advocate, with himself, the extension of the suffrage to females (laughter and loud applause); to those females, at all events, whose husbands had votes, and to all those who could claim a forty-shilling freehold. (A voice here cried out, 'Mrs. Disraeli for ever;' and that lady bowed from the gallery, and acknowledged the compliment). He would appeal to the rationality of his own opponent's intellect, if there were not ladies in England who would make as good a use of the franchise as gentlemen; such ladies for example, as Miss Caroline Herschell, the astronomer (cheers); Mrs. Somerville, the astronomer (cheers); Lady Lovelace, the mathematician (cheers); the late Mrs. Elizabeth Fry (cheers); the late Mrs. Barbauld (cheers); Miss Strickland, the historian of the Queens of England (a voice, 'God bless her'); Miss Mitchell, the astronomer of New York (cheers); Miss Fanny Corbaux, the historian (cheers); and Mrs. S. C. Hall, and hundreds of others who could be named (cheers, and a voice, 'Miss Martineau'). Certainly, Miss Martineau, one of the most distinguished of our British ladies (a voice, 'Mrs. Tindall;' cheers). He trusted that his honourable and gallant opponent would answer this question, and answer it satisfactorily to those ladies who had distinguished and ornamented that vast assembly by their presence (loud cheers). He called upon Mr. Disraeli, if he hesitated, to consider how much bribery and unfair influence would be destroyed, and how many good manners and high moral purposes would be established by enfranchising the ladies (hear, hear)."

The allusion to "Miss Mitchell, the astronomer," is a gratifying national compliment; but the additional words "of New York," are worthy the confused ideas of Englishmen, who make the double mistake of centralizing the whole of this country into one focus, and of locating that focus at New York. In the same way Mr. Webster was introduced, at a public dinner in London, as "a distinguished member of the upper Senate of New York." Such instances of glaring ignorance are too common.

Miss Maria Mitchell is a resident of Nantucket, in Massachusetts; she is a daughter of the Hon. William Mitchell, for some time a member of the Executive Council of the Commonwealth. She gained her European reputation as an accomplished and skilful astronomer, by the discovery of the comet, which is always alluded to by her name, on the night of the 1st of October, 1847. The comet was not discovered in Europe until the third of the same month, when it was seen by Father de Vico, the celebrated astronomer at Rome. The priority of Miss Mitchell's discovery was unquestioned; but she had forfeited her right to the gold medal, offered by the late King Frederick VI. of Denmark, for the first discovery of new comets, in consequence of neglecting to comply with the prescribed condition, not then generally known, that information of the discovery must be immediately transmitted to Mr. Schumacher, of Altona, if the discovery be made on the continent of Europe, or to Mr. Airy, Astronomer Royal at Greenwich, if made in any other part of the world; to whom communications from America might be forwarded through the Danish Minister at Washington, but in all cases by the first mail. From the neglect of this condition in similar instances, the medal was refused to Mr. G. P. Bond and to Dr. Bremeker, the latter of whom simply allowed a single post-day to elapse before communicating his discovery; and Messrs. Schumacher and Airy decided, upon consultation, to refuse it also to Miss Mitchell. Her father, however, had announced the discovery to Mr. Bond, at the Harvard Observatory, in Cambridge, in a letter transmitted by the first mail which left the island of Nantucket afterwards. In consideration of this fact, upon a representation of the peculiar circumstances of the case, that the claimant was a young lady of great diffidence, that the place of the discovery of the comet was a retired island, remote from all the high roads of communication; that the condition of the King's offer were not well understood in this country, and especially as there was a substantial compliance with them, in the direct transmission of the information to Mr. Bond; and that the priority of this discovery was universally acknowledged—the present King of Denmark, without hesitation, generously directed that the medal should be struck, and awarded to Miss Mitchell.—*Boston "To-Day."*

HOW ALEXANDRE DUMAS CURED HIMSELF OF THE CHOLERA.

In the preface to one of the latest of his multitudinous productions, the great Alexandre has presented the world with two very important things, "vainly," he says, "to be sought elsewhere," viz., a cure for cholera, and a proof of the infallibility of newspapers. Thus runs the narrative:

"On the 15th of April, 1832, on returning to my room, after taking leave of my two excellent and celebrated friends, Litz and Boulanger, who had been quaffing strong black tea with me as a remedy against the prevailing plague, I suddenly felt a weakness in my limbs, a tremour passed through my frame, my head reeled, and I had to grasp the table to prevent myself from falling. In a word, I had the cholera.

"Whether it was Asiatic or European epidemic, or contagious, I am entirely ignorant; but this I know, that, feeling a few moments more would deprive me of utterance, I made one last effort, and called for sugar and ether instantly.

"My housekeeper, an intelligent woman enough, having frequently seen me dip sugar in rum, after dinner, and swallow it, concluded I now wished something of the kind; and, filling a liqueur glass with pure ether, into which she popped the largest lump of sugar she could find, brought in the beverage just at the moment I had thrown myself on the bed, freezing in every member.

"Scarcely conscious, I mechanically extended my hand, felt something placed in it, and heard the words, 'Swallow this, monsieur; it will do you good.' So I raised this something to my lips and swallowed it—that is to say, half a phial of pure ether.

"To describe the convulsions caused by this diabolical liquid, as it traversed my torso, would be impossible, for I lost all consciousness almost immediately. An hour after, I came to myself, and found that I was rolled up in blankets and furs, with a jar of boiling water at my feet, while two persons, each holding a brazier of live coal, stood by, rubbing my members with all their might.

"For a moment I believed myself dead or in hell. The ether burned me within, the friction scarified me without. At last, after about a quarter of an hour, the cold acknowledged itself vanquished. I broke out into a perspiration, and the physician declared that I was saved. Just in time, truly; two hours more, and I would have been roasted alive.

"Four days after, the manager of the Porte Saint Martin Theatre stood beside my bed. His theatre was in a state of health even weaker than my own, and the dying called the recovering to his aid.

"'In a fortnight, at latest,' exclaimed M. Harel, 'I must have a piece that will produce fifty thousand growns at least; adding, to ensure my assent, that the feverish state in which he found me was admirably adapted for the production of an imaginative work, in consequence of the cerebal excitement which accompanied it.

"This reason appeared so conclusive that I began the work instantly; gave it to him in a week in place of a fortnight; and brought a hundred thousand crowns to his exchequer, in place of fifty thousand. True, the effort nearly drove me mad.

"Scarcely had I recovered in some degree when I learned the death of General Lamarque, and next day was named one of the chief directors of the funeral by his family. All Paris beheld this procession, made sublime by order, respect, and patriotism. What changed this order into disorder, this respect into violence, this patriotism into rebellion? I know not, and will never know, until the day when the royalty of July, like that of Charles XI., renders up its account to God, and that of Louis XVI. its account to man.

"On the 9th of June I read in one of the Legitimist papers, that I had been taken with arms in my hands at the affair at St. Mery, tried by court-martial during the night, and shot next morning at three o'clock.

"The paragraph had such an official look about it, and the recital of my execution, (which, indeed, I had borne with exemplary courage), was given with such detailed minuteness, all the particulars being fully authenticated, that for a moment I almost doubted my own existence. Besides, the editor appeared quite in earnest, and spoke kindly of me, for the first time in his life. It was evident, therefore, he sincerely believed that I was dead.

"I threw off the quilt, leaped from the bed, and ran to the glass to ascertain the fact. At the same instant my door opened, and a letter from Charles Nodier was handed me, which ran as follows:

"'Dear Alexandre—I have just read in one of the papers that you were shot this morning at three o'clock. Pray send me word if that will hinder you from coming to dine with me to-morrow.'

"I answered, that as to being dead or alive I had not quite made up my mind; but that, in any case, I should dine next day with him, as punctually as the statue of the commandant with Don Juan.

"Next day it was unanimously agreed that I was not dead."

ANECDOTE OF BURNS IN THE '93.

A public library had been established by subscription among the citizens of Dumfries in September, 1792, and Burns, ever eager about books, had been from the first one of its supporters. Before it was a week old, he had presented to it a copy of his poems He does not seem to have been a regularly admitted member till 5th March, 1793, when "the Committee, by a great majority, resolved to offer to Mr. Robert Burns a share in the library, free of any admission-money [10s. 6d.] and the quarterly contributions [2s.6d.] to this date, out of respect and esteem for his abilities as a literary man; and they directed the Secretary to make this known to Mr. Burns as soon as possible, that the application which they understood he was about to make in the ordinary way might be anticipated." This is a pleasing testimony to Burns as a poet, but still more so to Burns as a citizen and member of society. His name appears in September, as a member of Committee—an honour assigned by vote of the members.

On the 30th of this month, the liberal poet bestowed four books upon the library—namely, *Humphry Clinker, Julia de Roubigne Knox's History of the Reformation, and Delolme on the British Constitution.* The present intelligent librarian, Mr. M. Robert, reports, respecting the last-mentioned work, a curious anecdote, which he learned directly from the late Provost Thomson, of Dumfries. Early in the morning after Delolme had been presented, Burns came to Mr. Thompson's bedside before he was up, anxiously desiring to see the volume, as he feared he had written something upon it "which might bring him into trouble." On the volume being shown to him, he looked at the inscription which he had written upon it the previous night, and having procured some paste, he pasted over it the fly-leaf in such a way as completely to conceal it.

The gentleman who has been good enough to communicate these particulars, adds; "I have seen the volume, which is the edition of 1790, neatly bound, with a portrait of the author at the beginning. Some stains of ink shine through the paper, indicating that there is something written on the back of the engraving; but the fly-leaf being pasted down upon it, there is nothing legible. On holding the leaf up to the light, however, I distinctly read, in the undoubted manuscript of the poet, the following words:

"'Mr. Burns presents this book to the Library, and beg they will take it as a creed of British liberty—until they find a better.'

"The words, 'until they find a better,' are evidently those which the poet feared 'might bring him into trouble.' Probably, if the inscription had not been written on the back of the engraving, he might have removed it altogether: at all events; his anxiety to conceal it shews what trivial circumstances were in those days sufficient to constitute a political offence." Ay, and to think of this happening in the same month with the writing of *Scots, wha hae wi' Wallace bled!*

Fully to appreciate the feelings of alarm under which Burns acted on this occasion, it must be kept in view that the trial of Mr. Thomas Muir for sedition had taken place on the 30th of August, when, in the evidence against him, appeared that of his servant, Ann Fisher, to the effect that he had purchased and distributed certain copies of Paine's *Rights of Man.* The stress laid upon that testimony by the crown-counsel had excited much remark. It might well appear to a government officer like Burns, that his own conduct at such a crisis ought to be in the highest degree circumspect. We do not know exactly the time when the incident which we are about to relate took place, but it appears likely to have been nearly that of Muir's trial. Our poet one day called upon his quondam neighbour, George Haugh, the blacksmith, and, handing him a copy of Pain's *Common Sense* and *Rights of Man*, desired him to keep these books for him, as, if they were found in his own house, he should be a ruined man. Haugh readily accepted the trust, and the books remained in possession of his family down to a recent period—*Chambers's Life and Works of Burns, Vol. IV., just published.*

A KENTUCKY SCHOOL ROOM.

[From N. P. Willis's Letters to the *Home Journal.*]

The log school-house (at the door of which I left you in my last letter) was so remote from the world, there in the heart of the wilderness, that the laborious acquiring of skill in such encounters as ciphering and oratory seemed like the harnassing of knights for a crusade far away. Considering the